

[Price 8d. each.

Islamic Review

AND

MUSLIM INDIA.

RELIGION, ETHICS, POLITICS, LITERATURE, ART, COMMERCE.

A Monthly Journal devoted to the Interests of the Muslims.

Office: THE MOSQUE, WOKING.

Edited by KHWAJA KAMAL-UD-DIN, B.A., LL.B.

VOL. II.]

[No. 3.

After the Battle of Life	-	-	-	-	-	-	81
Arabic	-	-	-	-	-	-	82
The English Press on "Islamic Review"	-	-	-	-	-	-	83
Seyyid Abdul Kadir Jelani and Jesus:							
The Dying Forces of which—Christianity or Islam?	-	-	-	-	-	-	85
The Bishop of Winchester on Islam							
Islam and Rationalism	-	-	-	-	-	-	91
"Most Democratic Faith"	-	-	-	-	-	-	97
Further Misrepresentations	-	-	-	-	-	-	98
<i>By Lord Headley.</i>							
Indian Press Act and its Interference with Our Religion:							
An Open Letter to the Secretary of State for India	-	-	-	-	-	-	101
The Roman Emperor and Muhammad	-	-	-	-	-	-	117
The Sources of Muhammad's Inspirations	-	-	-	-	-	-	119
God's Gift to Man, and Man's Vow to God	-	-	-	-	-	-	123
<i>By Lord Headley.</i>							
The Muslim Woking Centre and Dr. Weitbrecht							
The Muslim Baptismal Pronouncement							
Samsara, Karma, Sursum	-	-	-	-	-	-	130
<i>By John Parkinson.</i>							
The Simplicity of Character	-	-	-	-	-	-	134

Price Eight Shillings per annum post free in advance; and in India Rs. 7.

*Single copies to be obtained from the Publisher, 99 Shoe Lane, London, E.C.,
and in India from Azeezmanzal, Lahore.*

London:

J. S. PHILLIPS, 99 SHOE LANE, E.C.

BACK NUMBERS OF "ISLAMIC REVIEW," 1913,
ARE READY FOR DESPATCH.

Such of our Subscribers as miss any of them, or wish to complete their file, are urgently requested to inform us by the next mail.

SH. NOORAHMAD, Manager.

۷۱۶
اسلامک ریویو کی قیمت میں اضافہ
موجودہ ضرورتوں کے مقابل رسالہ کا حجم کافی نہ تھا اسلئے سر دست رسالہ
قریباً ڈیوڑھ کر دیا ہے۔ آئندہ ممکن ہے بہت جلد حجم اور بڑے یا رسالہ مہینہ میں
دو بار ہو جائے قیمت سال روان اس وقت بعض سے بحاب پانچ روپیہ وصول
ہو رہی ہے۔ اور میں نے قیمت رسالہ سات روپیہ کر دی ہے۔ اسلئے میں ان احباب
کے بغیر مت میں عرض کرتا ہوں کہ یہ رسالہ تا جرات اصول پر نہیں چلایا گیا۔
غرض یہ ہے کہ اسکی بہت سی کاپیاں مفت غیر مسلم دنیا میں تقسیم ہوں۔ اسلئے
رسالہ کی اس غرض کو مد نظر رکھ کر یہ احباب خود بخود ذرا قیمت بچے یا لاہور
میں پیچیدین تو اون کی غنائت و الدین یہ امر ہی خدا پر چھوڑتا ہوں۔ یہ رسالہ
تو یہی مافی موصوفہ ہے کہ اسلام کا درخشندہ چہرہ نہ صرف غیر اسلامی دنیا پر چمکنے
لگایا ہے بلکہ خود انگریزی خوان مسلم طبقہ اسلام کا عاشق ہوتا جاتا ہے
خود بخود قلوب میں تبلیغ دین کا خاص جوش پیدا ہو رہا ہے۔ کل اسلامی دنیا
از سر نو اصلی اسلامی زندگی کی طرف آرہی ہے۔ جن خریداران رسالہ کا سال
کسی درمیان ماہ سے شروع ہوا ہے وہ بھی اگر گذشتہ سن کے نمبر منگو کر بحاب
شروع سال سے درست کر دین تو رسالہ سے بہت سا بوجہ بھکا ہو جاوے گا۔
کیونکہ متفرق حساب علی کی زیادتی کو چاہتے ہیں اور یہاں گنجائش نہیں۔
پری غرض تو یہ ہے کہ حنفیہ ممکن ہو یہ رسالہ مفت تقسیم ہو۔ سو اس میں
جو میرا مانہ بٹائے وہ عند اللہ اپنے آپ کو ماحور سمجھے۔

خواجہ کمال الدین Khwaja Kamaluddin

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ
 مُحَمَّدٌ وَآلُهُ عَلَى سُلَّةٍ الْكَرِيمِ

ISLAMIC REVIEW

AND

MUSLIM INDIA.

VOL. II.]

[No. 3.

AFTER THE BATTLE OF LIFE.

NAKED I stand before Thy throne,
 My hands upon my breast,
 My happiness in Thee alone
 And Thy eternal rest.

Not slothful rest, as some would think,
 But rest from earthly fears,
 The stream of life to freely drink
 Which in Thy home appears.

Dear Father, I can praise Thee now,
 The lengthy struggle o'er,
 Again repeat the oft-told vow
 And thank and love Thee more.

My gratitude is sweet to Thee,
 Though small the offerings seem ;
 It is the offering of a soul,
 And is no fancied dream.

The earthly treasures now with me
 Can never fade away ;
 Intensified they'll ever be
 For all eternity.

EL FAROOQ.

ARABIC.

THE ONLY SUITABLE VEHICLE FOR THE LAST MESSAGE OF GOD.

We quote the following extract from an article which appeared in the January and February numbers of the *Asiatic Review*, London, under the name of Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din, with the title, "Islam, Christianity and other Religions." The writer, while discussing the condition of the time obtaining then in the world at the advent of the Holy Prophet of Islam, made the following observations in order to show the superior claims and unique adaptability of the Arabic language as a conveyance for the Final Word of God.

BUT the history of the world had then taken a new turn. Circumstances arose which facilitated the means of mutual intercourse between various nations of the world. Different components of human society, so separated from each other by natural and artificial barriers, were about to come close to each other and make one united whole. The vast wide world was destined to be reduced into a single country, with countries as its cities and cities as its streets. Men of various nations and denominations were on the threshold of coming into contact with each other. To give different teachings to different nations at such a juncture was to cause a regular chaos; hence the great Divine wisdom was pleased to raise the last of its prophets in a place which occupied a central position in the known world, and which possessed a language the least susceptible to any change in form as well as in the meanings of its component words—a condition necessary for a language to become the conveyance for the last word of God. Languages come into existence, and, being subject to constant change in form and signification of its words, meet the fate of a dead language. This makes ancient literature unintelligible and difficult to understand. Every language spoken on the surface of the earth has met or will meet this fate, and if an exception can be made to this general rule it is, as European philologists like Professor Whitney and others admit, in favour of the language of Hedjaz in which Al-Koran was revealed. This peculiar conservative nature of Arabic, which makes it least susceptible to change, gives it a special claim, in my opinion, to become the throne of the last word of God. There is another peculiarity in this language—the suggestive and meaningful nature of its words. Arabic words in themselves are eloquent. They convey what, in other languages, we need pages to explain. They are, therefore, most suitable to convey theological conceptions. This is a very interesting subject in itself, and requires separate dealing; but it will sound here as an assertion on my part if I fail to quote one or two instances to substantiate my statement.

Take, for example, the word "sin." Theologies of various religions and creeds differ in their conception of sin, but do the various words in different languages which are equivalent to "sin" convey its theological conception? Does the word "sin," or any of its synonyms in any European language, convey the Church idea of sin? Does the Persian word *Gunah* convey the Zoroastrian conception of evil? or does the Sanskrit word *pāp* mean what is understood by wickedness in the Vedas? I fail to read in these words the real meanings given to them by various creeds. But come to the Arabic language, and its equivalents for sin in themselves convey what is taught in our religion about sin. Nothing, according to the teachings of the Koran, is in itself right or wrong. Everything created by God has its own particular use; take it from that use, and it is sin according to the Koran. And this is what the words *Junah*, *Zanb*, *Isn*, *Jurm*, and others literally mean. Anything turned away from its proper place is *Junah*; anything gone beyond its limits is *Zanb*; anything cut from the main thing is *Jurm*. To strengthen my position I here cite the word *Taubah*, which is Arabic for repentance. The word literally means to return to the point from which one has receded. Thus, sin in Islamic theology means to turn away from the point, and repentance means to return to that point. This is what is literally meant by the words *Junah* and *Taubah*. There are various other abstract truths in theology—conception of God, of revelation, of angels, of prophethood, of evil, of virtue, of hell, of heaven, and of very many other things. In other languages you have to read books and treatises to understand various conceptions. To know the Islamic conceptions, you have simply to consider the meaning of the Arabic words. They are a sufficient clue. No other language within my knowledge claims this peculiar richness of meaning, and therefore, I say, if the coming together of the different parts of the world into one whole demanded one cosmopolitan religion, if the old, old religion of obedience to God was to be revealed in its perfect form once for all, it could not but be through the medium of the Arabic language.

"THE ISLAMIC REVIEW."

By CLEMENT E. PIKE.

A PORTENT of our times, significant of much, is the *Islamic Review*. It is one of the many refutations of that prophecy of Kipling that "East is East and West is West, and never the twain shall meet." The order may not be quite accurate, and I have not Kipling by me to refer to, but in substance that is the prophecy, and it is refuted by the *Islamic Review*. The frontispiece to the first number of the second volume refutes it.

There East, in the person of Kwaja Kamal-ud-Din, meets West, in the person of the Rt. Hon. Lord Headley, and the significance of this meeting is emphasised in a little poem by Lord Headley printed on the first page, of which this is the last verse :—

“Great Allah, Lord, our God our King,
Who knowest what for us is best,
We praise Thy Name and loudly sing
The fusion of the East and West.”

All this meeting of East and West is no new thing to those of us who have attended one of our International World Congresses. At these great gatherings East and West are brought into pleasant contact at the festive board, over the teacups, in solemn temples, in railway carriages. It was in one of these, on that most delightful expedition to Chantilly at the World Congress in Paris, that I had the pleasure of meeting the editor of the *Islamic Review*.

In that compartment Europe, Asia and America were represented. The Universalist minister and his wife must have felt quite at home in it. There was a correspondent of a great London daily, and the editor of the *Islamic Review*. Since then *Muslim India & Islamic Review* (now the titles are reversed) has been sent to me, and I have found much in it of instruction and interest. It ought to remove prejudice against a religion professed by millions of our fellow subjects.

It has been a grievous calamity that, in the past, Christianity and Islam have met each other in degraded forms, thus causing hostility, contempt and misunderstanding.

“I received a letter,” writes Lord Headley, “it was *àpropos* of my leaning towards Islam, in which the writer told me that if I did not believe in the divinity of Christ *I could not be saved*. The question of the divinity of Christ never seemed to me nearly so important as that other question : Did He give God’s message to mankind? Now, if I had any doubt about this latter point, it would worry me a great deal ; but, thank God, I have no doubt, and I hope that my faith in Christ and His inspired teachings is as firm as that of any other Muslim or Christian. As I have said before, Islam and Christianity *as taught by Christ Himself* are sister religions only held apart by dogmas and technicalities which might very well be dispensed with.” There are, I suppose, few Unitarians who would not respond to this with a hearty “Amen.”—*Christian Life*.

O PEARL Divine, white pearl that in a shell
Of dark mortality art made to dwell.
Alas! while common gems we prize and hoard,
Thy worth inestimable is still ignored.

MAQQARI (a Muslim Sufi).

SEYYID ABDUL KADIR JELANI AND JESUS.

THE DYING FORCES OF WHICH— CHRISTIANITY OR ISLAM?

I.

THE current number of the *Moslem World*, a Christian missionary organ, publishes a very suggestive article with the heading, "The Dying Forces of Islam." In it Dr. Zwemer, the writer, a notorious calumniator of Islam, with his usual want of judgment, tries to announce to the world that Islam is in the throes of death, and its fate doomed. "The forces of death," he says, "are already at work, and it is only a matter of time when they will do their work." He fortifies himself in saying so by reference to a small booklet recently issued under the title, "Where is Islam?" by Sheikh Muhammad el 'Atlar, of El-Azhar University, Cairo. The young author, in it, complains of conditions now obtaining in certain Muslim quarters not warranted by the Quran, and the writer in the *Moslem World* says the following in reference to it:—

"In this pamphlet of only thirty-two pages we have a cry from the heart of a Moslem of the old school, despairing of reform and watching with regret the decaying forces at work in Islam. It is not a book of controversy . . . but is addressed to Moslems by one of themselves. It is a cry of despair. . . . We translate verbatim some of the most striking portions of this treatise, which lays bare the very heart of Islam."

In these translated portions which this worshipper of a God in man advances as a sign of the decay which, as he says, has sapped the vital forces of Islam, we find the following also:—

"I sought for Islam in India, but no sooner had I reached Madras than my heart was disturbed and overwhelmed with sorrow; and for what reason do you suppose? As soon as I came to this land of unbelievers, I picked up their books translated, in which the Moslems recorded the life of the Seyyid Abdul Kadir el Jelain, whom they regard as a God to be worshipped. Would that they only mentioned him as a prophet or disciple, but they give him the attributes of Deity. For example, they call him Lord of heaven and earth; the one who helps and hinders; the one who has the control of the universe; the one who knows the secrets of the creations; the one who raises the

dead and heals the blind and the lepers ; the one who forgives sins and takes away calamity. When they visit places built in his memory they say, ' O thou most excellent fountain of eternity, O Lord Abdul Kadir el Jelani.' What sane man would thus take the titles and attributes which are only proper in the case of God and apply them to one of His creatures ? Woe be to any heart at such a state of Islam. By far death is better than life for such Moslems, and they deserve punishment in this world and the world to come."

What a strange psychology is possessed by an average Christian missionary. In his zeal to attack other religions the missionary always forgets his own. He never thinks of his own weak armoury against the very weapon which he so unscrupulously uses against others. In his own false coins he is often paid back, and yet he never risks a fresh attempt. If to call one coming out of a woman's womb a God was a religious error, or to accept Him as "the One who raises the dead and heals the blind and the lepers," forgives sins and takes away calamity, amounts to death to a faith, we think Christianity received its first mortal blow at the Council of Nice, when the simple faith of the Nazarene was paganised, and its Founder was given the place of Jove. The writer in the *Moslem World*, with his characteristic heated brain, never thought that the very quotation which so exultingly he made to fortify his position could absolutely be applied *mutatis mutandis* to his own religion. The piece quoted needs no elaborate paraphrase. We have simply to make a slight change in three places—to put "Christian" for "Moslem," "Jesus" for "Seyyid Abdul Kadir el Jelani," and "Christianity" for "Islam," and the whole text would disclose a true picture of the Christian world. Will Dr. Zwemer accept the situation he has created for himself with all its consequences ? Does he not pay the same homage to the Son of Mary which the most ignorant amongst us wrongly do to the Saint el Jelani ? Does he not say the same to Jesus which a few illiterate Muslims say to Seyyid Abdul Kadir ? And if such is the case—and Dr. Zwemer, as a good Christian, cannot say otherwise—has the young Sheikh from El-Azhar rightly pronounced when he says, "What sane man would thus take the titles and attributes which are only proper in the case of God and apply them to one of His creatures ?" Jesus, however, never allowed that. He resented most strongly even being called good—an attribute, as Jesus argued, only proper in the case of God.

SEYYID ABDUL KADIR JELANI AND JESUS.

We know the life and history of the Muslim Saint Seyyid Abdul Kadir, of Jelani (peace be on him !). He was one of the great saints of Islam, with spiritual powers not less than those of Jesus, which Islam every now and then produced. If we

have to accept whatever we receive in black and white from past generations, as the Christians do concerning the Evangelical record, we read things about many Muslim saints which the writers of the four Evangelists' record, could not imagine of Jesus Christ. We know the authentic nature of the Biblical record, and we can safely assert that the genuineness of the writings about the great Seyyid of Jelani is comparatively on firmer ground. And now, if we have to judge from what we read about these two characters, we shall be amply justified in giving Seyyid Abdul Kadir a position much higher than can be claimed for Jesus. If Jesus raised one or two persons from the dead, the Divine of Jelani brought hundreds to life. Moreover, his life is not enveloped in obscurity, like that of Jesus. We possess his teachings, which he himself dictated to his disciples. They reveal mysteries of Divine lore which surpass what are mostly read in the Bible. Name anything you know of Christ which supports His claim to Divinity, and you will read something similar or better than this about Abdul Kadir Jelani. Why is one a god and the other a man? We admit that the Moslem saint had father and mother. But to come out of a virgin womb is not a unique character in Christ. We know of more than a dozen of sacred characters in the *Maha Baharta* whose mothers were virgins, and the Sacred Book of the Hindus can claim better authenticity than the books of the New Testament. The whole tribes of the Mughals, who first sprang in Central Asia, trace their descent from a virgin mother. And were not many of the Greek gods the issue of virgins? It is pitiable. We cannot understand a clergy brain which, with the academical gown on his shoulders, forgets all rules of deduction and induction whenever and wherever the personality of Jesus is concerned.

(To be continued.)

THE
BISHOP OF WINCHESTER AT WOKING,
AND
ISLAM.

WE are pleased to note that the Muslim Sunday lectures at the Woking Mosque, though in their early stage, have not failed to invite the attention and courtesy of the Church dignitaries. We find that we have been alluded to in the speeches of various reverend gentlemen who have taken part in certain public functions in the last two weeks at Woking. When speaking at the C.M.S. Anniversary, Dr. Weitbrecht, late of the Batala (India) Mission, made the following remark about our work: 'It was a movement which had to be fought, for it was not one

which tended for the betterment of the people." If we properly appreciate the real significance of the hint conveyed in these words of Dr. Weitbrecht in token of the courtesy due to us from him in his Mother Country, as we have known each other for years in India, we are not less thankful to the Bishop of Winchester for his kind references to us, as well as for his exhorting his hearers to behave with charity and courtesy. We, however, reproduce here what we find in the columns of the *Woking Herald* of March 20, while reporting the speech of the Bishop:—

"In his address to the candidates after laying-on of hands (when performing the rite of Confirmation at Christ Church, Woking), the Bishop, in speaking of the difficulties they would have to contend with in life, said he wanted them to be not merely good men and women, but also Christian men and women. Since he was last in Woking he understood there had been started amongst them a movement of the Mohammedan religion. That was rather a difficult thing for Christian people to know how to consider, but he wanted them to look upon the good side. They must evidently behave with charity and courtesy, but they could not help entirely refusing it as a religion, although it helped them to understand what the truth of their own religion was. Heaven forbid that he should say the Mohammedans had no goodness in them, and he often thought they set Christian people an example in the matter of prayer; but their religion was not one which they could accept, because they could not believe that anyone but Christ could have been sent from God to be the Redeemer of mankind. The good he wanted Woking people to get out of it was that they should realise more willingly, faithfully and thankfully what the reality of their religion was. The Mohammedans certainly could not say in the words of the Bible that God was a treasury of grace for His people. Their lives were Christian lives, and they must fashion them that way—a life of unselfishness, patience and sacrifice, and follow the Life which was a perfect example to the whole world. So they might see a little more clearly than before what Confirmation was, they must think of those things and exercise themselves in those matters. They must be very steady in their prayers, and look upwards to Him, taking care they were not found by a Mohammedan ignorant of the Lord to whom they belonged."

The *Woking News & Mail* of the same date, while reporting the above nearly in the same words, under the heading, "Bishop and Muslim Religion," also adds the following :—

"The Vicar read the preface to the service, and before and after the ceremony of the laying-on of hands the Bishop delivered an address. In the latter he issued a warning to the candidates against the evils which would beset them, and mentioned that since he was in Woking last there had been started a Temple or Mosque of the Mohammedan religion. While perhaps it was difficult for them as Christian people, yet they must look straight at matter, behaving with charity and courtesy."

We wish the Bishop of Winchester would preach this excellent sermon of charity and courtesy to his co-labourers in the East in the field of Christ. It would have helped on the cause of his Religion there, and its missions would not have been such a hopeless failure as they have proved in the East. If a tree is to be judged by its fruits, as says the gentle Prophet of Nazareth, we are constrained to remark that our experience of the best fruits of Christianity has unfortunately been very bitter. It is all very well to speak highly of the beauties of our religion, but mere words carry no weight with, and cannot reach the mind of the hearer if he does not find them translated into action. We hear much of Christian charity and meekness, but we invite the attention of the Bishop of Winchester, as well as of our other readers, to some excerpts from the Christian Missionary writings* in India which we append to our "Open Letter to the Secretary of State for India." Could there be found more vulgarity, indecency, or want of taste than has its exhibition in the words of some Christian Missionaries in India when writing about One who commands the reverence and allegiance of millions of people in the four corners of the world?—we mean the Prophet of Islam. With such bitter experience it is really a happy thing to find the Right Reverend Bishop advising his audience to behave with charity and courtesy, which we should admit we have had from every gentle soul we come in contact with here.

The other remarks of the learned Bishop concerning Islam are not less interesting. Making allowance for the brevity of his remarks, which perhaps the occasion demanded, one would like to read something more substantial in support of what the Bishop said of Islam. The Bishop made the following assertions :—

1. That the Christians could not accept Islam because they could not believe that anyone but Christ could have been sent from God to be the Redeemer of Mankind.

* See pp. 112-115.

2. That the Mohammadans certainly could not say in the words of the Bible that God was a treasury of grace for His people.

3. That they should follow the Life, which was a perfect example to the whole world.

4. That Islam would help them to understand what the truth of their religion was.

We could excuse the Bishop for any dogmatic assertions he made, especially when addressing children of immature age, to whom the rite of Confirmation was being administered ; but it was not an occasion for the shepherd of the Winchester diocese to speak of Islam without saying something to strengthen his bald assertions. In the first of the four statements given above, he speaks of two impossibilities—one in man and the other in God. The Bishop said that a Christian could not accept Islam. We take the Christian world to be a rational one, and if belief is a matter of opinion we fail to appreciate any legal, moral or physical impossibilities which debar a reasonable person from changing his beliefs. Of course, if one has to accept his religion from another, without giving a second thought to it, we need not worry much. But if the Western nations have shown their independence of opinion in all other avenues of human thought, and have already awakened to the necessity of bringing religion to the test of reason, we think Islam has every occasion to rule in future the religious side of the Occidents, as it never demands immolation of reason for the acceptation of its verities. The trend of European thought is towards Islam. Rationalism discovers principles many of which only coincide with Islam. Unconsciously and unintentionally the Western world has become nearly Muslimised. They are moving in the groove towards the teaching of the Quran. What European culture thinks is Islam. It is only a question of time with the disappearance of local prejudices to establish identification.

As to the impossibility of God to create the like of Christ, we again fail to understand the logic. We do not believe in an impotent God who is powerless to create or send a Christ. Is He not Omnipotent and Omniscient? Was not Christ a chemical combination of elements with the Spirit of God in Him? Christians, we hope, do not believe in the destructibility of matter ; we presume that all those elements which, conjoint together, assumed the shape of the Son of Mary are still extant, and within the knowledge of God, who can form them into the same combination again. If He once breathed His spirit into a Son of Man, He can do so again. We hope that the right reverend gentleman of Winchester does not believe in the abeyance of Divine Power. God is eternal, and so are His attributes, as well as His Spirit. What He could do some two thousand years ago, He can do now. Moreover, we read in the Scriptures that He can raise men out of stones. If

Christians do believe in such an Omnipotent God, and we hope they do so, we cannot realise the meaning of the learned Bishop when he said that they could not believe that anyone but Christ could have been sent from God to be the Redeemer of mankind.

But metaphysics is not, perhaps, a desirable attendant when we have to tread the holy precincts of religion. Yet still there is a plainer question which so often troubles us, to think of Christ as to be the Redeemer of mankind. He made His appearance less than twenty centuries ago. The New Dispensation came by Him when the old Adam died and the new Adam came. The world was redeemed thus. But to profit by the Grace of the Blood, it is said, faith in it is necessary. But the world lived for about 4,000 years before Jesus was born. Millions of mankind left the world with the old Adam in them. Why were those before Christ saddled with the curse of the law? Even after His appearance He remained unknown to millions of mankind till now, He is still so to millions who never heard of His Gospel. If faith in the Grace of the Blood is indispensable for redemption, what about those we are speaking of? If redemption consists of having the new Adam in us, and that we can only know that when believing in the Divinity and Atonement of Christ, all before Christ and those who never heard of Him remained without a new Adam, and could not be redeemed. They belonged to mankind, and constituted indeed the greater portion of the human race. It was physically impossible for Christ to be their Redeemer. Will the good Bishop of Winchester still preach to his diocese that Christ was the Redeemer of mankind?

(To be continued.)

ISLAM AND RATIONALISM.

I.

FREEDOM OF THOUGHT.

IN the Editorial of *The Rationalist*, Chicago (Vol. II., No. 20), we find the following in an interesting letter by Mr. M. M. Mangasarian to the Cedar Rapid clergy:—

“Will you tell me then the name of the creed which grants liberty of thought and speech to all men, be they believers or unbelievers? Is it not true that even the Unitarians refused to fellowship with Theodore Parker, and expelled Emerson from his pulpit? Was not Swing tried for heresy? Was not Thomas thrown out of his Methodist church? Are heresy trials over now? The strongest argument you could bring against my position would be to mention a single evangelical denomination which always has, or does now, advocate full religious liberty. But a stronger argument than that, which you could advance, would be to quote a single Bible text which recommends liberty of conscience. “He that believeth

not shall be damned." Could a religion with such a text respect anybody's liberty? Could such a religion be moral even? Can there be any morality where there is coercion of conscience? You may reply that this text is an interpolation. Why then do you keep it in your 'Holy' book? And *you*, Mr. Liberal Preacher, have you removed this text from the Bible in your pulpit? And what about the common people who are not clever enough to know that not all of the 'Holy' book is holy—that when you say, 'the Word of God,' you mean only those parts which you—*you*, consider holy? And does not that make *your* opinion the 'Word of God?' Is the 'There is no other name given under heaven whereby men can be saved' also an interpolation? Is Jesus's 'All that came before me were thieves and robbers' another of the unholy texts which has crept into the 'Holy Bible'?

"Will you also explain to your congregations how a religion could be divine and infallible, and still tolerate dissent or opposition? Be good enough to explain that point very clearly. In your reply to this, if you should favour me with one, please do not forget to quote the texts from the Bible or the creeds which make freedom of thought one of the indispensables of the moral life. And let me have your candid opinion as to how a religion may coax belief by the promise of crowns, thrones, white robes and golden harps, or coerce belief by threats of 'everlasting damnation' and still respect liberty of conscience. Is morality possible without liberty of conscience? Do you really think then that, 'like Don Quixote I am fighting windmills,' as one of you gentlemen remarked from his pulpit, when I combat a religion which has hanged innocent women as witches, burnt philosophers as criminals, and shed more blood than any other institution? Yet I could forgive and forget all that—the one thing I cannot overlook is that a religion which denies liberty can only produce slave-morality."

Mr. Mangasarian has made an apt demand, but we doubt if it will elicit any satisfactory reply from the quarters concerned. With Pauline Christianity, promulgated at the Council of Nice and her subsequent annals, before him, the writer may well ask "how a religion could be Divine and infallible" and still tolerate dissent or opposition? But the study of Islam would change the opinion of the writer. Islam claims to be a Divine and infallible religion, and yet tolerates dissent and respects difference of opinion. Islam enjoins freedom of action, and encourages personal judgment, and cannot, therefore, but respect difference of opinion. The Prophet Muhammad was so alive to its importance in the mould and development of human intellect that he regarded the difference of opinion as a blessing of God. A teacher raised by God cannot do otherwise. Is not the thinking power in man a gift from God? But to think is to differ, and if religion is also a similar gift, it cannot destroy the other work of God. How can two gifts from the one and the same source militate against each other? A religion which, therefore, for its acceptance demands the sacrifice of intellect, and leaves no room for personal conviction, is not from God, but a mere human ingenuity.

MISCONCEPTION OF RELIGION.

It is, in fact, the misconception of the religion, as well as that of its function and utility, which makes the whole situation unreasonable, and leads to disparity between religion and reason. Religion, according to Christian tenets, comes for human salvation from the penalty of sin ingrained in man's nature. Sin is the foundation of the Christian religion. All other doctrines are its offshoots and corollaries. If we start with this unreasonable datum, the scope of reason is curtailed. But if religion is a gift from God to man, its function must be similar to that of the other Divine gifts. Everything created by God strengthens human nature, and helps him in his advancement. So we should think of religion. The Quran, the Sacred Book of Islam, at least explains this to be the only object of religion when it says the following :—

*“Set thy face then straight towards the Faith,—
the nature made by God, in which He has made
all men : that is the right religion.”—The Quran
30 : 29.*

God must have had some defined design in creating mankind. Some course was necessary for his guidance. God prescribed that course for man, or He created man to pursue that course in order to bring that great Divine design to accomplishment. This course is religion from God. How can there be any variance between it and reason? Nay, the first function of religion from God should be to feed reason and nourish intellect.

MUSLIM CONCEPTION OF RELIGION.

Man, according to the teachings of the Prophet Muhammad, enters into the world with an immaculate nature, free from sin, and willing to abide by the law. He comes equipped with the highest capabilities* to make unlimited progress. He needs light and guidance to bring his high potentialities to actuality. This guidance, when it finds its manifestation to man through Divine revelation, is termed religion in common phraseology. This is the Muslim conception of religion, and if reason is a human faculty, any creed or faith which entails its mutilation is not worthy the name of religion : it is mystery and mythology, and has been invented to feed credulity and work on human fear, and a rational being cannot be compelled to endorse it. How clearly the Quran bears out this truth when it says :—

“God will not burden any soul beyond its power.”—(2 : 86.)

He cannot burden us with a belief that excites revolt from the rational side of man.

RELIGION AND REASON KINDRED TO EACH OTHER.

And is not the power of Reason the greatest gift of God to man? If every other gift of God has its use, reason must also

* The Quran 59 : 4-6.

have its legitimate use. Reason is a magnificent potentiality, the only difference between man and the lower animal. But the latter has been given no religion, and if God has been pleased to bless man with religion and reason in addition to what he possesses in common with the beast, the two simultaneous gifts must be akin and auxiliary to each other. Thus the primary object of religion seems to be to help man to cultivate his faculty of reasoning. It should encourage personal conviction, and enjoin upon man the duty of thinking for himself. It should create in him a desire for freedom of action, and make him alive to the importance of the liberty of conscience. The following we read in the Quran on this score :—

“Is one who goeth grovelling on the face (with head bent downward) better guided than he who goeth upright (with head erect) on a straight path ? Say, God hath brought you forth and gifted you with hearing and sight and heart ; yet how few are grateful.”—(67 : 22, 23.)

To emphasise freedom of action and liberty of opinion the Book of God in the above quotation takes two apposite illustrations from the animal kingdom, and thus brings home to us the truth that man was made to act as a free agent. One is the quadruped who walks on the earth of God with head bent down, the other is the two-legged animal—*i.e.*, man, who walks with head erect. Look to the muscles and formation, as well as position of the respective necks of the two, and two different objects seem to have been designed by Providence in the creation of man and the four-legged animal. Man can see his way at a long distance, and can make a choice between the right and crooked path ; while a quadruped cannot do so. Man can move his head to the right and the left, while the latter cannot do so easily. This observation leads us to one conclusion : Man has been made to find his own way and to discriminate between right and wrong, while the lower animals cannot do so. Someone else should do it for them ; man is to lead, the animal is to be led. Therefore one who cannot form his own judgment, and is satisfied with the state of being led by others, has hardly justified his being created a man. He is like a quadruped, and proves himself ungrateful to his Creator, as the next verse in the above quotation shows :—

“God hath brought you forth with head and hearing and sight and heart ; but yet few are grateful.”

And what is gratitude to God ? Lip gratitude counts for nothing with God. True gratitude to Him consists in making proper use of His bounties according to Islamic teaching. Our abuse or misuse and even disuse of them makes us ungrateful to God ; and this idea has been brought home to us in the above-quoted verse. We have been given sight and hearing, with head erect to see everything before us in its proper light ; we

have been given a heart to come to a right conclusion with a view to action to our best advantage. If we follow others blindly, we have not done justice to the wise providence of the Creator in making our head erect on our shoulders.*

Mr. Mangasarian may challenge the whole Christian world without fear of contradiction, instead of saying the following to his local rival :—

“In your reply to this, if you should favour me with an answer, please do not forget to quote the texts from the Bible as the creeds which make freedom of thought one of the indispensables of the moral life.”

The demand will always remain unanswered. Freedom of thought in the modern Church of Christ is an impossibility. Its whole religion is based on mystery, and it is to the profit of the clergy to make it more obscure. In fact, a thing which is not clear to him cannot be explained by one man to others. Pauline Christianity cannot allow freedom of thought, indeed there is nothing to invite thinking. Children are, we read in the Bible, welcome in the kingdom of God, and *childhood is not, perhaps, a suitable time for freedom of thought*. But we have made the above quotation from the Quran for the adherents of Rationalism to think upon. Can they find anything better than or parallel to it elsewhere which so appropriately and yet strongly urges upon man freedom of action and thought. With our limited sphere of information we fail to do so. If religion comes from God to guide us and help us in the development of our various faculties, and with us there can be no other function for a religion to perform, it must first of all help our reason, it must allow full scope to it and respect personal judgment. This is not the only quotation one can make from the Quran. It is the *first* and the *last* book in the whole sacred literature which always appeals to its reader's reason, and invites his consideration and reflection. In more than 150 instances the Book of Islam induces the reader to ponder over its teachings, with the help of his wisdom, knowledge, reason and judgment. If freedom of thought was necessary for the mould of human character, and if individual opinion and personal conviction were essential to a healthy moral life, it would be a pity and a libel on the general Providence of our Creator to think that He left man to attain it through the hardest struggles and cruellest shedding of blood which Europe has witnessed. Freedom of thought is a real blessing, and if Divine revelation comes to help man God should reveal to us its importance. If the Bible fails to contain any teaching encouraging freedom of thought, it is because the revelation of the House of Israel, which founded its last evolution at the hand of Jesus Christ, concerned that period of the

* *Islamic Review*, Vol. I., No. 9, pp. 333, 334.

history of the human race when its intellectual growth was in its infancy. Rational explanation of religious truths was then premature: acts calculated to tickle curiosity and inspire awe, or reference to beliefs sanctified through usage, were sufficient to impress the people around the sacred teachers. Miracles were resorted to, and appeals were made to old beliefs. But the Prophet Muhammad appeared at an age when the intellect of mankind in general was at its dawn. The child-man had reached his age of discretion, and required nourishment for his mental and intellectual growth. That was the most opportune moment for a revelation from God, which should teach its truths on rational lines. To convince others by miracles or compulsion is simply to ignore the rational side in man, leave alone what is the real nature of a miracle. "Let there be no compulsion in religion, as the right way has been made distinct from error on rational grounds," is the famous verse in the Quran.* The word used in the text is an inflection of *Bayyan*, which means to make a thing clear by arguments and reasoning. So says the word of God, that hitherto was given in the form of an order and commandment for the child-man; but now everything has been explained to a rational man. If he is unable to accept it, there ought to be no compulsion or persuasion.

The Book of Islam always explains its truth by reference to Nature. It draws analogies between the word and the work of God; this is the only way to appeal to our reason. For example, we may refer to one of the shorter chapters of the Quran entitled "The Bee." It chiefly deals with the subject of Revelation, its necessity and its existence; and to make its teaching clearer it often refers to various phases and phenomenon of Nature, and then concludes the argument in words like the following:—

Verily in this are signs for those who *ponder* (11); sign for those who *understand* (12); sign for those who *remember* (13); will you not *consider* (17); they may ponder over it (46); in this a sign for those who *hearken* (67); sign for those who *reflect* (69); sign for those who *consider* and use wisdom (72); sign for those who *believe* (81); if ye do but *understand* (97).

The Book of Islam abounds in verses like the above. In more than 150 places, as said above, it appeals to our wisdom, to our judgment, to our common sense, and to our reflection and thinking power. The word "sign" in the Quran corresponds to the word "miracle." The object of a miracle was secured by the appeal to reason, which is really a true miracle for rational beings.

In the absence of such teachings in the Bible, it is not to be wondered at if the Christian zeal in the spread of their faith became fanaticism, and caused wholesale massacres in the name

* The Quran 2: 267.

of religion. Christianity was "meek and mild" for the first three centuries, but no sooner had it emerged from the company of "serfs and slaves" than it forgot the teaching of that gentle creature the Holy Nazarene, and very soon became knee-deep in human blood. Till the end of the eighteenth century God was glorified in the immolation of humanity and in the killing of conscience, when Rationalism began to make its successful onslaught. It succeeded after all in becoming an efficacious check against the sanguinary disposition of Church religion for some eighty years before the last decade, when the European greed and self-assertion made religion a tool. Blood was again shed in the name of religion, and conversions to Christianity were again secured at the point of the sword.

The history of Islam presents an instructive contrast on the other hand. Knowledge flourished under Islam, freedom of thought, *which found its birth* in the Quran, produced fine intellects in Islam in the realms of science and culture. No Galileo was seen, old and wrinkled and downcast, "with the darkness of his cell," and no Copernicus received a threat from the Church of Islam to seal his lips in the following words: "We will burn you alive, we will turn you into charcoal." No Shelley was ever expelled from an Oxford of the Muslim lands. Men of culture and thought received encouragement, and laid the foundation of that realm of discoveries and invention which has produced the present state of progress and advancement. And if Mr. Mangasarian still asks, "Will you tell me then the name of the creed which grants liberty of thought and speech to all men, be they believers or unbelievers?" WE HAVE ISLAM!

"MOST DEMOCRATIC FAITH."

LECTURE IN NOTTINGHAM ON ISLAMIC ETHICS.

AT the Mechanics' Hall last evening Prof. H. M. Leon, late of the Imperial University, Constantinople, delivered an interesting lecture under the auspices of the Nottingham Ethical Society on the subject of "The Ethics of Islam."

Prof. Leon observed that non-Moslems, unless they had made the teachings of the great Arabian Prophet a subject of special study, had generally a very erroneous conception of the Islamic faith. Yet Islam possessed, in common with all other moral creeds, the eternal heritage of universal truth. It was the most democratic of faiths, appealed to the conscience of humanity, and asserted the absolute equality of all mankind before a universal ruler and controller. It disclaimed

"mysteries," and constantly affirmed the intimate communion of the human soul with the Being from whom it emanated.

In Islam, the service of man and the good of humanity constituted pre-eminently the service and worship of God. The dignity of labour was over and over again inculcated by Mohammed. One of the commonest misconceptions of Islam was that it inculcated fatalism. The position of women in Islam was generally misunderstood and misrepresented. The idea that Moslems believed "that women had no souls" was absolutely erroneous. Probably no religion in the world so inculcated the pursuit of knowledge as Islam.—*The Nottingham Guardian*, Dec. 11, 1913.

"ISLAMIC REVIEW."—Our sincere thanks are due to Prof. Leon for his noble and opportune effort in dispelling that cloud of ignorance and misrepresentation in which the most rational and humanity-edifying religion of the world remained here buried for centuries. The learned professor has rightly observed that fatalism is "one of the commonest misconceptions of Islam." A religion which respects labour, self-exertion and self-reliance, and teaches that nothing but good comes from God, cannot give a slight countenance to that enervating doctrine so fatal to humanity as fatalism, which makes evil a predestinated thing, and discourages all efforts to repel it. Islam condemns fatalism in the clearest possible terms, as we showed in our last volume, pp. 395-398.

FURTHER MISREPRESENTATIONS.

IN January of the present year an unusually misleading article on the subject of apostasy appeared in the *Daily Mail*, and, later on, *East and West*, with the result that the following article appeared in the columns of the latter organ :—

After having been a Muslim by conviction for twenty years, Lord Headley has recently announced this fact to the world. We could wish that during these twenty years he had studied the teaching and practice of Mohammedans more carefully than he has done. He would not then have said: "It is the intolerance of those professing the Christian religion which more than anything else is responsible for my secession. You never hear Mohammedans speak concerning those of other religions as you hear Christians talk of one another. They may feel very sorry that other persons do not hold the Mohammedan faith, but they don't condemn them to everlasting damnation because of a differing belief. *The Daily Mail*, which contained the announcement of the conversion of Lord Headley, contained in its next issue a letter from a lecturer in Arabic in London, in which he wrote à propos of the suggested intolerance of Christians: "If a Moslem in any really Moslem

land were to do as Lord Headley has done, and announce his conversion to Christianity, his life would not be worth a day's purchase, and his death would be justified by the express teaching of the Koran. Such is Moslem toleration; converts are only allowed to live where the strong arm of Christian Justice can protect them." In reply to Lord Headley's statement that Islam does not condemn to the torment of hell those who fail to acknowledge Moham-mad, we may quote the words of the Koran (Sura 4, v. 59). "Those who disbelieve our signs we will burn them with fire: as often as their skins are roasted we will give them new skins." This is one of many similar statements contained in the Koran.

To refute the idea that true Moslems would murder a brother so foolish as to renounce the faith of Islam, I may quote one line which appears in the Holy Koran immediately after one of the most beautiful and impressive passages in the Book: "Let there be no compulsion (no violence) in Religion." No true Moslem would have any feelings but of deepest pity and sorrow for a deserter from the fold presided over and tended by our Gracious Shepherd and King. Myself, a true Moslem of nearly forty years' standing, I have four sons, all of whom will follow me in the faith; but supposing, for the sake of argument, that one of them so far forgot himself as to change his religion, should I wish him ill? No, I should be deeply grieved, but should not alter in my fatherly affection one iota. I should argue with him, and do my very best to show him the folly of deserting Islam, but if my arguments failed I should deal just as kindly with him as before. In the same way, if I were so erratic as to change to any other faith than Islam I know that all my brethren in Islam would consider that I had broken down mentally, and did not quite realise the folly of my action. Not for one moment would they think of murdering me. Of course, there are fanatics in all religions. How about the fanatics of the "Holy" Inquisition? How about the fanatics of the Middle Ages who tortured, maimed, and burned those who thought differently from themselves? Of course, if I, a Moslem, went into some wild parts I could name in Central Africa, and openly stated that I was about to change my religion, I should stand a very good chance of being cut down by some religious fanatic. Thank God, however, there is no chance of me or my sons ever stepping from the light back into the darkness. We all know the value of being able to approach our Maker without any intervention of any kind, and our love for God, and desire to be directed by Him, are strong indeed.

I remember once, after a particularly cruel act had been committed, there was a suggestion of dealing severely with the culprit, but the offence was so bad that nothing short of the death penalty would have met the case; and then one, more wise than the others who were considering the case, said "Leave him to God."

There is nothing in the Koran sanctioning the assassination of a man for changing his religion. If any man, once having embraced the faith of Islam, should be so wicked and so foolish as to desert it, he must be dealt with in the Highest Court. We have no right to kill him, for that would be murder. All the Muhammadan law is founded on the Holy Koran, and in none of the pages of that Book are to be found any punishments prescribed for the apostates except the suffering which they must undergo in the next life for dying in unbelief. All the punishments begin after death. If the apostate were to be punished with death *here* the verses in the Koran would be differently worded. It is expressly stated that no guidance shall be given to the apostate, whose punishment shall take place *in the future state*—not here.

The learned Arabic scholar who wrote in the *Daily Mail* says: "Converts are only allowed to live where the strong arm of Christian justice can protect them." How many converts are there? How many desert Islam after experiencing its blessings? I should like the learned gentleman to furnish me with a list of converts from Islam to any other religion.

Faithfully yours,

HEADLEY.

ISLAMIC REVIEW.—We do not deny that punishment awaits the unbelievers when they die. Islam is not a Bohemian Society. It believes in good beliefs. Do not all our actions proceed from beliefs? Do not bad beliefs lead to wrong actions? and if evil actions are not to be meted with punishment, all morality and purity of life goes to the wall. The Quran has taught simple truth when it says:—

"Those who disbelieved our signs, we will burn them with fire."

It is no reply to Lord Headley's remark, which complains of eternal damnation of those who have no faith in the Church religion. The words of the noble Muslim Baron are too clear to admit of any misreading when he says: "You never hear Mohammadans speak concerning those of other religions as you hear Christians talk of one another. . . . They (Muslims) do not condemn them to everlasting damnation because of a differing belief." We believe in the ultimate salvation of the whole human race. The words "saved" and "unsaved" are not known in the Muslim theology. Are not the thirty-three Articles of the Athanasian Creed full of eternal damnation to those who have the misfortune to disbelieve in them? Even those who never heard of them in life do not fare better.

THE INDIAN PRESS ACT

AND ITS

RECENT INTERFERENCE WITH OUR RELIGIOUS LIBERTIES.

An Open Letter to the Secretary of State for India.

MY LORD,—The judgment of the Calcutta High Court of Judicature pronounced in the proscription case of *Comrade*, a leading Muslim organ in India, may not have escaped your lordship's notice. It speaks in eloquent terms of the unlimited extension which the application of the Indian Press Act of 1910 may receive at any moment at the hands of the local authorities. It may be applied to cases never contemplated by its framers and to circumstances not warranted by the state of things which led the Government of Lord Minto to devise such an elastic piece of legislation. Recent events in India have amply confirmed the learned dictum of the High Court. The case of the Zamindar Press confiscation has already rightly excited the British surprise as to the strange point of view from which an official eye in India reads sedition in the honest criticism of their actions. But nothing could advertise the bankruptcy of judicial discretion in the application of this repressive measure more than the movement which this iron machinery of the law has received at the hand of the Punjab Government in binding under heavy securities two Muslim presses there which are solely devoted to publishing religious literature. Within one week the Badar Press of Qadian and the Ahle-Hadees Press of Amratsar have received notice from the local Government to deposit respectively 3,000 and 2,000 rupees for publishing some articles on religious polemics. The collective Hindu and Muslim ability and intellect raised their strong voices in December last against such an application of the Act from their respective camps—the Indian National Congress and All-India Muslim League.

(2) We are sorry to say that as yet we are not in possession of all the necessary papers under official attestation. We,

however, have been supplied with the copy in the original of the articles impeached by the local Government. The one which appeared in the *Ahle Hadees* is the smaller of the two, and we produce its English translation at the end of this letter. The *Badr*, Qadian, of the 30th October 1912, publishes a leader headed "The Birth of Christ," in which the paper says that there are many aspects of the question of the birth of Christ, and that one of them is that in which the Christians put their faith; they claim that Christ's superiority which is shared by none else lies in the fact that he was born of a virgin (mother) and that he was free from the taint of sin which is inherited by all the human beings from Adam from the beginning of the world. The paper, however, characterises the above belief as wrong, and says that sins are not the result of birth, but of one's own actions, and that the first sin was committed by Eve and not by Adam. This being so, it adds, a woman* is the greater source of sin than a man, and one who is born of a woman alone without having in him the part of man is calculated to be (more) sinful. Indeed, one born of a man or woman without the partnership of the other cannot be a perfect man, and this was perhaps the reason why Christ did not, as is alleged, marry during his life. At any rate, says the *Badr*, the fact of Christ having been born of a virgin (lit. without a father) cannot be a proof of his superiority. Indeed, the fact in question implies that the Jews had not among them a single person who could call himself the father of the Prophet who prophesied about the (appearance of the) last of the Prophets (Muhammad). Continuing, the paper says, that according to the naturalist, the birth of Christ was against the laws of nature. This aspect of the question has been dealt with at length by one, Haji Hafiz Muhammad, in the booklet entitled the "Najm." The paper then reproduces excerpt from the said booklet which go to show that though it is against the laws of Nature that living beings should be born without connection between males and females, the birth of Christ is not an impossibility. In order to make the remarks of the Haji clear, a brief explanation is necessary. There are two schools of

* This is not the Muslim belief as regards woman, who holds a nearly equal position with man in Islam. The writer in the *Badar* refers to the basic principle of Christianity, as taught at present, which makes sin an inheritance of man, and reduces woman to an abject position. This is what has been believed by the Christian writers: "The organ of the devil," "the foundation of the arms of the devil," "a scorpion ever ready to sting," "the gate of the devil, and the road of iniquity," "the poison of the asp," "the malice of the dragon" are the blessings which St. Bernard, St. Anthony, St. Bonaventure, St. Jerome, St. Gregory the Great and St. Cyprian have conferred on their womankind; and the following was exclaimed by Tertullian: "Do you know that you are each an Eve; the sentence of God on this sex of yours lives in this age; the guilt must of necessity live too; you are the devil's gateway; you are the unsealer of that tree; you are the first deserter of the Divine Law."

thought in the Muslims as to the birth of Christ ; the orthodox hold that Jesus Christ was born without the agency of a male parent, and the other hold that He was born in the ordinary way from the union of Joseph and Mary. The writer of the article impeached, believes in the birth of Christ from a virgin womb, and tries to give a rational and scientific exposition of the fact that a female may give birth to a child without union with a male. On the authority of certain Oriental treatises on physiology, he says that there are certain females who do possess male and female nerves and faculties in themselves, and that in conjoint action of such faculties within themselves they may bring forth children without male agency. This has been expressed in refined language.

(3) It rouses our amazement and excites our disappointment to find that such religious polemics may elicit an order like the following from the Punjab Government. It makes us seriously apprehensive of far-reaching consequences if these vagaries of the Press Act are not soon stopped. The Badar Press was crushed under the Act on November 5, 1912, and since then it has not been able to resuscitate it.

*Under Section 3, Sub-section (2) of the Indian Press
Act, 1910.*

To SHEIKH MIRAJ-UD-DIN,
Keeper of the *Badar Press*,
QADIAN,
Gurdaspur District.

WHEREAS it appears to the Government of the Punjab that the *Badar Press*, kept by you, in Qadian, Gurdaspur District, in respect of which a declaration was made under Section 4 of the Press and Registration of Books Act (XXV. of 1867), on the 5th April 1905, before the Magistrate of the Gurdaspur District, has been used for the purpose described in Section 4 (1) (c) of the Indian Press Act, 1910, that is to say, printing an article entitled "Viladat-i-Masih," (The birth of Christ) which appeared in the issue of the *Badar* newspaper (Qadian) of the 30th October 1913, and which contains words which have a tendency to bring into contempt a certain class or section of His Majesty's subjects in British India, namely Christians.

NOW, THEREFORE, under the provisions of Section 3, sub-Section (2) of the Indian Press Act, 1910, you are hereby required to deposit with the District Magistrate of Gurdaspur, within seven days of the receipt of this notice, security to the

amount of rupees three thousand or the equivalent thereof in securities of the Government of India.

By order of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor
of the Punjab and its Dependencies.

(Sd.) C. A. BARRON,
Chief Secretary to Government, Punjab.

Dated, Lahore,
the 27th November 1913.

(4) If such writings, my lord, are to be taken, and so shows the order of the Government, as an attempt to bring Christians into contempt within the meaning of the Press Act, it means that the Government of India has resolved to make use of the convenient Act of 1910 as an instrument to destroy religious liberties vouchsafed to us in the Proclamation of 1858. I have used the expression "within the meaning of the Press Act" advisedly. It is a well established principle of jurisprudence that in construing statutes and enactments the statutory words cannot be taken for their ordinary popular signification. They change in their meaning with the change of circumstance attending the case they are applied to. Juridical construction of a statutory word, therefore, differs from its everyday interpretation. In this very case, for example, what may amount to contempt in writings on politics may not be so in a matter of religion. Besides this, no enactment can be construed so as to become an infringement of some other law, nor can it be given a scope which entails trespass on the borders of sacred promises granted by a Government to its subject. No local Government, therefore, should even presume to apply the Act in discussion to cases which affect the religious liberties of the subject. This can be the only safeguard against the elastic nature of the expressions in which the Indian Press Act has been unfortunately worded. But if the word "contempt" in the said Act is to be given such a wide interpretation as it has received from the Punjab Government in the matter of religious controversial literature, it will simply throttle all religion preaching. We admit that in the heat of the moment some religious writers, especially the Christian controversialists (see Appendix), sometimes become intemperate in their language, and transcend the borders of decency; but to make the Press Act an instrument of repression, when other remedies in the course of regular Judicial Courts are open to the injured party, would simply be detrimental to the cause of religion, and would arouse suspicions not helpful to the good administration of a country which is the "Home of Religions."

(5) If the Punjab Government, my lord, had given a second thought to this question from its religion-preaching aspect, the

judgment must have been different. Again, I say, if the Government of the land of the Five Rivers had ever tried to appreciate the real object and function of religion-preaching, or had cared to understand what it really meant or consisted of, with all the graceful covering under which the preaching is done out of average taste and courtesy, she could have at once come to the conclusion that the provisions of the Press Act cannot bring religious literature within its purview without infringing the sacred vows of her late Gracious Majesty, Queen Victoria, in 1858. What, after all, is "*preaching of a religion*"? Let us be frank and plain in analysing this problem. Surely it consists entirely in showing the beauties of one religion at the expense of others. Is not the exhibition of one's merits the *ipso facto* exposure of others' demerits if the two rival religions stand pole apart on their basic doctrines as Islam and Pauline Christianity do? Is not the preaching of the Divinity of Christ a gross insult to the Muslim conception of the Godhead? Is not the teaching of the Quran that no one can be responsible for others' burdens an absolute contradiction to the dogma of vicarious atonement? Will your lordship think of those psychological moments when one renounces the religion one is born in and embraces a new faith; analyse those mental conditions which actuate a person to cut himself off from his kin and kindred. Can anyone hazard such a step, unless or until he is disgusted with the religion he inherits from his parents. Religion is a most precious thing with man. Even those among us who are most liberal-minded in other matters of opinion, are prone to show a strong conservatism in their adhesion to their faith. We all are attached to our respective creeds, and one who attempts to wean us from it must first create hatred in our mind towards it. Conversion in religion, therefore, my lord, can only mean the turning of attachment into abhorrence. In plain speech, it is to create this disgust and abhorrence against other religions and their adherents which every missionary effort tends to. Preachers may differ according to their taste and culture in the means they adopt in creating this state of feeling in the minds of their would-be converts, but the object is always the same. Except to create abhorrence, contempt and disgust against Muslims and their religion, what can be the object of the Christain missionaries sent from the West to convert us to the Western persuasion in reviling our religion and its Holy Founder? For full fifty years the most virulent literature has come from the Christian pens. Our Holy Prophet and his teachings have been made the victim of a baneful calumny and most shameless, abusive remarks.† We know for certain that

† In support of our statement we reproduce what we are told appeared only in the last volume of *Noor Afshân*, a Christian weekly of Ludiana. We give the date and the page of its various publications for an easy reference:—

June 12, 1913, *page* 8.—The revelations which came to Muhammad were brought by the devil.

June 19, 1913, *page* 1.—The Muhammadans are really donkeys, and

these teachers of Christian charity and meekness have no personal grudge against the Muslims and the Holy Prophet. They are sent to convert non-Christians to their faith. It is their business, therefore, to create hatred and contempt against Islam in Muslim and non-Muslim minds, as without that they cannot secure the object for which they are subsidised by the Christian Nations in the West. A Muslim missionary must do the same and try to attain the same object, though in a gentlemanly way, as he cannot resort to abuses and calumnies under the clear injunctions of the Quran, which lays a particular obligation on the Muslims to show a thoroughly respectful attitude towards the leaders of other religious communities.‡

(6) We know that the Punjab Government has tried to show its impartiality by binding down a Christian weekly for 2,000 rupees. But that brings us not the least gratification. It is a question of principle we contend for. The question which troubles us most is: Can any religious preaching be carried on in India with impunity from the iron clutches of the law if the Indian Press Act has to receive such an elastic scope? If you respect liberty of conscience and allow freedom of religious preaching without creating direct or indirect hindrance in the spread of one's faith—and these are the first conditions which a Muslim must have from his rulers, and without which he cannot live, it being his sacred duty under the teaching of the Quran§—your lordship will have either to secure the

their deeds are like the asses. *Page 6.*—Muhammad was himself a lusty admirer of female beauty and amorous.

August 8, 1913, *page 6.*—The Musalmans have the ropes of Satan around their neck.

September 25, *page 10.*—All married women of Arabia are prostitutes.

September 25, *page 9.*—The wives of Muhammad are called mothers of the faithful, and therefore they are *shoes*. With them they shall beat them on their head. . . . Muhammad was the introducer of immorality.

October 24, 1913, *page 14.*—It is the God of the Quran and Hadees (traditions of the Prophet Muhammad) who is thus creating men full of sin, who not only does not give them the right path, but, on the other hand, always misleads them.

November 7, 1913, *page 12.*—Their (Muslims) salvation is based on the earning of sins. To work good deeds has been held the means of deprivation to them. But sin has been ordained as the only aim of their natural life.

December 18, *page 9.*—In this page the writer says that Muhammad made a nation to always commit sins, and their signs are that their leaders speak deliberate falsehoods, commit murder, robbery, burglary, think adultery a glad tiding, allow masturbation as a deed of piety; everybody among them is accompanied with Satan, and they are all hellish.

‡ Revile not those whom they call besides God.—The Quran 6: 107. Summon thou to the way of thy Lord with wisdom, and with kindly warning; dispute with men in the kindest manner.—XVI. 126.

§ And that there may be among you a people who write to the Good and enjoin the Just, and forbid the Wrong.—III. 100. Summon them to thy Lord.—XXII. 66.

immediate repeal of the Press Act or else keep all religious controversies beyond its province, as has hitherto been the case. We fail to recognise the development of any new events which have caused this radical change in the policy of the Government in matters of religious controversy. It was in or about 1897 when the Muslim subjects of the Punjab, through Anjuman Himayat Islam, of Lahore—a representative body of the Punjab Muslims—approached the Government of Sir Mackworth Young, then Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab, to take preventive action against the publication of a book named “Umhatul-Moomineen,” written by a Christian missionary, as it surpassed all other Christian publications in India in the gross nature of its language.] But the Government did not accede to our wishes as its interference would have amounted to an interference with the freedom of religious opinion and its expression, a privilege of the Indian subject under the Proclamation of 1858. It was a sound policy, and the Muslim complainants were satisfied as to its fairness. This was not the only book of the kind. Christian polemic writing is proverbially notorious for want of taste. It may be said that this all occurred before the enactment in question. But the Press Act hardly changed the character of Christian writings. A book named “Asbat-Kaffara”¶ was published by a Pastor who lives under the very nose of the Punjab Government. I do not mean to insinuate that all these Christian writings managed to escape the vigilant eye of the Government. I have mentioned all these facts to fortify my position when I say that religious literature was never meant to be regulated under the stringency of the Press Act. We cannot forget circumstances which cause some legislation, as we have always to keep them before our eyes in order to secure the justification of its application. Were not anarchism and political disturbances the chief reasons which induced Lord Minto to promulgate this Act I. of 1910? With some justification the Act may be applied to writings which may cause sedition and seriously endanger public peace. But what religious writings have to do with it is an absolute mystery to us. Nothing can be more virulent, more disgraceful and more venomous than the writings of the Christian missionaries in India. They have been so for the last fifty years. But we do not remember any riot, or affray, or any breach of the peace between the two religions on account of such writings, though the land of the Five Rivers is the hotbed of religious controversies. If the writings of the missionaries could not disturb the tranquility of the country, nor affect the magnanimity of the Muslim spirit in religious matters, harmless writing, like that of the Badar or of the Ahle-Hadees, couched in polite and guarded language, could not upset the balance of a Christian mind. This all leads us to think that religion was never

|| Some of its extracts are given on page 13.

¶ See page 12 for some of its extracts.

intended to be dragged within the purview of the Press Act. And no one can do so without the abrogation of our religious freedom.

(7) It has already been clearly shown that to preach and spread Islam or to convert others to our faith is our most sacred and essential duty. It has also been submitted that no religion can successfully be preached without destroying the teachings of other religions which are diametrically opposed to the former. Unless a person is disgusted with his own belief he will not renounce it and embrace some other. And if an attempt to create such a state of mind is to be taken, my lord, to mean contempt within the meaning of the Press Act, all religious preaching will receive a fatal blow. We Muslims cannot be satisfied with such a state of things. Leave aside conversion of others to Islam, we cannot teach our religion to our own people. Have not Christian missionary methods been interwoven like a net all over the whole country? Have not schools, hospitals, and colleges been opened to teach the doctrines of the Christians? Is it not to our interest to keep our own people away from influence of the Christian mission, and to explain to them the absurdity of their religion, if we think it to be so? How can we do it without bringing the chief doctrines of the Christians to adverse criticism? Inheritance by sin, divinity of Christ, chiefly based upon His birth from a virgin womb, and the doctrine of atonement: these are the chief doctrines, and they must be proved false if we wish to save our people from Christianity. This is what has been done in the papers impeached. Does it not amount to clear interference with our religion? We go further, and say that if the rule of the Punjab Government in the matter in question is a true exposition of the law, how can we publish our sacred Book—the Quran—which denounces the Pauline doctrines of Christianity in terms much stronger than what we find in the writings from the Badar and the Able-Hadees Press? And, to enlighten your lordship on the subject, I quote some of the passages from the Quran as below:—

“They say: ‘The Beneficent God hath gotten offspring.’ Now have ye done a *monstrous* thing! Almost might *the very Heavens be rent thereat and the earth cleave asunder and mountains fall down in fragments*, that they ascribe a son to God when it beseemeth not the God of Beneficence to beget a son. Verily there is none in the heavens and in the earth but shall approach the Beneficent God as a servant.”—(19: 91—94.)

“And that it may warn those who say, ‘God hath begotten a Son.’ *No knowledge of this have either they or their fathers. A grievous saying to come out of their mouth. They speak no other than a lie.*”—(18: 3, 4.)

“*Infidel* are they who say God is the Messiah,
Son of Mary.”

“They surely *are infidels* who say, ‘God is the third of the three,’ for there is no God but one God ; and if they refrain not from what they say, a grievous chastisement shall light on such of them as are infidels.”—(5 : 86, 87.)

These verses are eloquent enough, and I am afraid they also demand the application of the law more aptly than the writings of the Badar and the Ahle-Hadees, if the Punjab Government reading of the Press Act is correct. If the said two presses have been validly bound, is it unreasonable for us to fear some future proscription of our Holy Book, or of any commentary upon the verses quoted above, together with the proscription of the New Testament, which, in the words of no other person than the Great Moral Teacher of Nazarene, speaks of the Jewish Rabbis as *an evil and adulterous generation of vipers*, and of the former prophets as *thieves and robbers*, because the words bring their descendants—the Jew subjects of his Majesty—into contempt? These are but a legitimate conclusion if the Government has to be consistent, and will lead to dire results. We think that the Government of the Punjab did not give a thoughtful consideration to its order and in the heat of the moment, which brought the Muslim press in India under difficulties, especially after August 1913, the advisability of the measure remained out of sight.

(9) In conclusion, I draw your lordship’s attention to an important aspect of the whole situation in Muslim India. There has been “unrest” in the Hindus as well as in the Muslims of India. But the two “unrests” differ in their characteristics and causes. For long we kept away from all politics, but, if some of us have been won over to it, it is the want of wise statemanship here as well as there in dealing with certain questions affecting Muslim interest that have created the situation. Muslims are a religious body ; they are devoted to religion. With them, religion is everything. They are most jealous of it, and everything which directly or indirectly interferes with their religion is sure to excite the utmost dissatisfaction in them. In every upheaval of Muslim agitation it was religion, and only religion, which played the sole part. Religious kinship made them sore at every indiscreet pronouncement of the Prime Minister. Religion connects them with Turkey, and a wise statesmanship demands very cautious handling of all questions appertaining to Turkish affairs. Religion was at the bottom of the sad Cawnpore affair. It is a pity that with this before the Government an indiscreet step has been taken which really endangers religious liberties. Will your lordship in Council be alive to the situation ?

KHWAJA KAMAL-UD-DIN,

Dated March 16, 1914.

Editor, *Muslim India*.

(Translation of the Article in the Ahle-Haaqees.)

ATONEMENT IN THE BIBLE.

WAS JESUS OF THE GOSPEL SINLESS?

Our Christian friends believe that sin is divided into two kinds—natural and legal. They define natural sin in this way : Because man is the son of Adam, who committed sin, therefore every son of Adam is sinful by nature. And the legal sin they define thus : that disobedience to Divine law is sin.

By these two imaginary definitions they conclude that Jesus was not the Son of Adam, because He was born only of a woman, therefore He was the Son of God. Moreover, He did not do anything against the law ; hence He was sinless, and hence He can atone for the sins of all mankind.

We have already shown in our first article on “Jesus of the Gospel” that Jesus was born like other mortals—by crossing of a male and a female ; therefore, He was sinful like other mortals, as the Bible says :—

Job ix. 2 : “I know it is so of a truth : but how shall man be just with God ?”

Ecclesiastes vii. 20 : “For there is not a just man upon earth, that doth good and sinneth not.”

1 John i. 8 : “If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.”

If, for the sake of argument, we suppose that He was born without father, that in no way proves the point of our Christian brethren, because it is written in Job xiv. 4 : “Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean ? not one.” xv. 14 : “What is man that he should be clean ? and he which is born of a woman that he should be righteous ?”

Here you have three prophecies that apply to none but Jesus Christ. There is nobody who is born of woman only, save Jesus Christ, because it is the law of Nature ; but according to the belief of Christians Jesus was born without a father.

This shows that Job came to know through a special revelation that sinlessness of a certain man shall be asserted on the ground of his being born without father. Therefore, he told the people beforehand that not only those are sinful who are born of a man and a woman, but those also are sinful who are born only of a woman. Woman is more sinful than man, because she did not sin herself alone, but induced Adam to sin.

Genesis iii. 6 : “And when the woman saw that the tree was no good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eye and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof,

and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her, and he did eat."

1 Timothy ii. 14: "And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression."

The above verses show that Jesus Christ was also sinful like other people through his mother by birth. Let us see now whether he was sinless according to the law:—

Matthew x. 34, 35: "Think not that I am coming to send peace on earth, I came not to send peace but a sword. For I am come to set a man against his father and the daughter against her mother and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law."

Good God! how beautiful and worthy of following is this teaching! To create enmity between a father and a son and to set a daughter against her mother is a sin.

(2) Jesus Christ abused priests and learned Jews.

Matthew xii. 38, 39: "Then certain of the scribes and the Pharisees answered saying, Master, we would see a sign from Thee. But he answered and said unto them, An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign."

Matthew iii. 7: "O generation of vipers."

(3) Matthew xii. 46, 47, 48: "While he yet talked to the people, behold his mother and brethren stood without desiring to speak with him. Then one said unto him, Behold thy mother and brethren stand without desiring to speak with Thee. But he answered and said unto him, Who is my mother? and who are my brethren?" John ii. 4: "Jesus said unto her, Woman, what have I to do with you, my hour is not yet come." Who was she? The mother who kept awake for nights that he might sleep, who many a time went without meals that he might eat, took trouble that he might rest in comfort. What a pity!

When he became strong he addresses her as "woman." What a pertinent address! This shows why he died at the early age of 33, and was hanged on the Cross. The Bible says Honour thy father and mother that thy days may be long.

(4) John x. 8: "All that ever came before me were thieves and robbers, but the sheep did not hear them." Is it not a sin to call all other prophets thieves and robbers?

(5) Jesus contradicted himself, and his prophecies were not fulfilled. According to Matthew, he predicted (xvi. 28): "Verily I say unto you, There be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the son of man coming in his kingdom." Time is passed and the generations after him have perished, but he has not appeared as yet."

xvi. 20: "Then charged he his disciples that they should tell no man that he was Jesus the Christ." Is it not a lie? Is it not a sin?

(6) He loved women who were not related to him in any way. John xi. 5, 20, 28, 29: "Now Jesus loved Martha, and her sister, and Lazarus."

(7) He used to drink wine. Matthew xxvi. 29: "But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new with you in my father's kingdom."

And he made others drink. John ii. 6—10: "And there were set there six water pots of stone, after the manner of the purifying of the Jews, containing two or three firkins apiece. Jesus saith unto them, Fill the water pots with water. And they filled them up to the brim. And he saith unto them, Draw out now, and bear unto the governor of the feast; and they bare it. When the ruler of the feast had tasted the water that was made wine, and knew not whence it was, the governor of the feast called the bridegroom and saith unto him, Every man at the beginning doth set forth good wine, and when men have well drunk then that which is worse, but thou hast kept the good wine until now." Who on earth does not know the abuses of wine? It has been rightly called "the mother of impurities." But what of a religious leader who did not only drink himself, but made others drink?

Matthew xix. 17: "And he said unto him, Why callest thou me good? There is none good but one—that is, God." Here Jesus confesses that he is not sinless.

In short, according to the decision of the Old and the New Testaments, Jesus was sinful by nature and according to the law. If he was sinful he cannot atone for the sins of others, according to the Christian teachings. So Jesus can in no way carry away the sins of all Christians.

Christian friends, give up this unbecoming and fanciful idea of Atonement, and believe in the Holy Book which in few but portentous words says about Jesus, son of Mary, as *illustrious in this world and the world to come*.

APPENDIX.

"ISBAT-I-KAFFARA."

By T. Howell, Pastor of English Church, Lahore. Printed at the Newal Kishore Steam Press, Lahore, 1913.

PART I.

Page 3, lines 11 and 12.—Reproachfully addressing the Mussalmans and Aryas, the writer says—That because the leaders of you both were wicked criminals and frail minded.

Page 10, line 3.—Seed of crime which is called the Satan's part every now and then sprang from Muhammad's mind.

Page 20, line 9-10.—Just out of his own desire or Satanic delusions, Muhammad praised the idols and used to prostrate before them.

Page 20, line 15.—He (Muhammad) did also frequently remain in subjection to Satan and sorcery.

Page 25.—Notwithstanding Gabriel's endeavouring to remove the dusk of his (Muhammad's) heart by repeated washings, which was seed of crime or the spermatozoa, or part of the Satan, it was never removed from him. Muhammad might have blackened his heart by frequently indulging in committing crimes without controlling up his mind.

Page 27.—Muhammad was particularly arrested in the steam of hell, yet all this happened to him on account of his own crimes under which he laboured till his death.

Page 31-32.—The Muhammadan Moulvies (*i.e.*, the learned theologians) committed crimes of adultery, robbery, and the like, they made these transgressions in compliance with the desires of Muhammad under the veil of his motto Lailaha illallaho (which is the fundamental principle of Islamic monotheistic belief and which means there is no God but One, the only One).

Pages 31-32.—Not only did these teachings create in abundance the Muhammadan prostitutes, but even the heaven, being full of "hoors" and "gilmans," became a regular "chakla" (a place reserved for adultery and sodomy).

Page 49.—Not only Muhammad's kalima encourages the criminal to commit crimes more boldly, but it also serves him as an anti-dyspepsia pill for digestion of crimes and plucks up their courage to indulge in the life of extreme criminality. The blessings of Muhammadan kalima, are practically seen to overcrowd the "chakla" and town "bazaar" (*i.e.*, places of public prostitution and whoredom).

Page 55.—The case of the God of Quran is just like the devastated town and the blind Raja.

Page 62.—In this page, Muhammadan God is satirically depicted as tyrant.

PART III.

Page 29.—Cursed is he who does not believe in the atonement of Christ.

Page 33.—It is the God of Quran only who is blood-thirsty and hungry.

Page 39.—Quran is the manufactured collection of Toret, Injil, the Jewish, Christian, Qureshic, and other inauthentic stories, the rituals of ignorance and unreliable traditions.

Page 54.—In this page the Holy Quran is represented as the robbed property, full of thousands of blunders, fabricated stories and a sentiment of a compound stimulant for sensuality.

"UMMAHAT-UL-MOMININ."

Written by Ahmad Shah, Christian, R. P. Mission Press, Gujranwala.

Page 1.—Absolutely given up to debauchery, and murder is the important element in the life of Muhammad of Medina.

Page 26.—Treacherous and tyrannic jealousy . . . was reserved for himself by Muhammad.

Page 51.—This connection cannot be named anything but mere debauchery.

Page 63.—Prayer of this amorous old female flocker prophet was heard.

Page 77.—He robbed God and spoke lies.

Page 85.—His fire of lust was enkindled and patience was failed, and he did what he did.

Page 112.—Had he possessed shame, he should have drowned himself in a handful of water.

Page 115.—What lies were spoken and what tricks were played.

Page 121.—He was a debauch and lived in debauchery.

PAMPHLET NAMED "HAZRAT MUHAMMAD."

Written by Rev. G. H. Raoos, D.D. Published by Christian Literature Society for India.

Page 6.—There are many things which prove him a guilty criminal.

Page 10.—Greed and rage were strong evils in Muhammad.

Page 14.—He was a criminal.

He was himself indigent of salvation.

He can, in no way, be spared from the hell.

He was himself a criminal and, like other delinquents, was entitled to be thrown in the fire (hell).

PAMPHLET "HAMARA SHAFIK KAUN HAI."

Written by Rev. J. H. Raoos, D.D. Printed at Ludhiana Mission Press.

Page 5.—Muhammad himself a criminal and wanted the recommendation of a sinless.

Page 6.—Muhammad shall be in want of some intercessor and redeemer just like the ordinary criminals.

PAMPHLET "DAFE-UL-BOHTAN."

Written by Rev. Rauklin. Printed at the Mission Press, Allahabad.

Page 69.—We cannot but call Muhammad the same richman (which means the richman who according to St. Luke was from Abraham's descent lived a splendid life, and when died was thrown in hell).

Page 87.—The companions of Muhammad are depicted as murderers, cruel oppressors, adulterers, deceivers, robbers, doers of every kind of evil deeds, &c.

Page 154.—(He was) a worldly man and follower of his lust, and such men often indulge in such things. Sorrow for all such men because they have the same end and they shall be collectively thrown in the wrath of God—*i.e.*, in the lake of fire and sulphur (the hell).

PAMPHLET "SEERAT-UL-MASIH WAL MUHAMMAD."

Written by Rev. Thakar Dass, American Mission.

Page 6.—Muhammad was in his person a sinful. He was practically delinquent.

Page 14.—The very shape of Muhammad like the Arabs shows him the greatest indulgent in sensuality and lover of women.

Page 21.—Muhammad was a devious and infernal man.

Page 31.—It seems that he was ensnared by Satan.

Page 35.—Readers! be careful that you might not be taken over by Muhammad's fraud.

PAMPHLET "ANDROONA BIBLE."

Page 70.—The owner of the sign of this anti-christ is originally the same old bloody serpent (Satan), yet when he opens his mouth his very jaws show him personified in the histories of the Pope and the Prophet of Arabia.

Page 75.—The religion of Muhammad and that of the Pope are the jaws of one serpent (Satan).

PAMPHLET "MUHAMMADI TWARIKH IJMAL."

By Rev. William, of Rewari. Printed at the Christian Mission Press, Rewari.

Pages 1 to 7.—Muhammad, the leader of robbers, dacoits, burglars, murderers, and deceivers.

Page 8.—Muhammad was a great sinner.

TAFTEESH-UL-ISLAM.

By Rev. Rogers.

Page 56.—All this is Muhammad's forgery and fabrication.

Page 65.—He was a sensualist, envious, selfish, and follower of his carnal passions. The Quran is his fabrication.

Page 80.—It is Muhammad's forgery and barking.

Page 97.—He is shown a wicked man by all his deeds, the great prejudice and treachery is found in him. Attended by an unfaithful and selfish mind. He inculcated love of murder. His beginning and end were terminated in the extreme indulgence in sensuality.

Extract from the judgment of the Calcutta High Court in the "COMRADE" Proscription Case.

In the above case, on the appellate side, under the Indian Press Act, Chief Justice Laurence Jenkins makes the following remarks :—

"The provisions of Section 4 are very comprehensive, and its language is as wide as human ingenuity can make it. . . . It is difficult to see to what lengths the operation of this section might not be plausibly extended by an ingenious mind. They would certainly extend to writings that may even command approval. The High Court's power of intervention is the narrowest ; its functions are limited to considering whether the applicant to it has discharged the almost hopeless task of establishing that his pamphlet does not contain words which fall within the all-comprehensive provision of the Act. I describe it as an almost hopeless task, because the terms of Section 4 are so wide that it is scarcely conceivable that any publication would attract the notice of the Government in this connection to which some provision of that section might not directly or indirectly, whether by inference, suggestion, allusion, metaphor, implication, or otherwise apply. . . . I recognise the force of the argument that the Act is now being applied to a purpose never intended"

TARRED STATUTES.

The *Standard* of March 16 makes the following remarks in an article under the above heading :—

“The stringent provisions of the Indian Press Act are being used for other purposes than the suppression of sedition. The printers of a periodical published by one of the missionary societies at Ludhiana, in the Punjab, have been called upon to furnish security to the amount of £133, it being held by the authorities that an article on the Christian doctrine of the Atonement was likely to bring the Mahometan religion into contempt. Some little time ago similar measures were taken in respect to a Moslem journal published at Amritsar, on the ground that it had attacked Christianity.”

AN APPEAL TO THE PUBLIC.

In connection with the Press Act, Sir Henry Cotton and Sir William Wedderburn have issued an appeal in which, after drawing attention to the facts, they say :—

“Both the Indian National Congress and the All-India Moslem League have passed strong resolutions calling for the repeal of this particular Act, though not, of course, of any measures under which incitements to violence may be dealt with, and that influential public meetings of protest have been held all over India. We, therefore, make an earnest appeal to the public of this country, in whose name and by whose authority the Indian Press Act is administered, to demand such an immediate alteration of the law, whether by amendment or repeal, as will put an end to the abuses which have accompanied its operation.”

This appeal has already been signed by a number of influential people, including the Bishop of Lincoln, Dr. Clifford, Lord Courtney, five Liberal and three Labour M.P.'s, six ex-M.P.'s, Mr. Blunt, Mrs. Bradlaugh Bonner, Professor Hobhouse, Mr. J. A. Hobson, civil and military officers who have served in India, and Indians resident in England.

—*Review of Reviews*, March 1914.

HERACLIUS THE ROMAN EMPEROR AND THE PROPHET OF ISLAM.

THE Holy Mission of the Prophet of Arabia was not, like that of Jesus or Moses, confined to his own people. It was universal, and meant for the whole human race.* In response to the Divine Call, he sent his message beyond the boundaries of his country. He sent embassies to the princes of the neighbouring nations announcing to them his claim, and inviting them to the faith of Islam. He sent Dehya, one of his companions, to the Court of Rome with a letter addressed to Heraclius, the Emperor. The Muslim envoy reached the Emperor when Heraclius was making a pedestrian journey to Jerusalem in fulfilment of his vow for his splendid victory over the Persians. The messenger was treated with great respect, and the Emperor evinced great interest in the claims of the Holy Prophet. But Heraclius wanted to know more of the character of the Holy Prophet. It happened that there was a caravan of some Meccan merchants from Arabia. The Emperor summoned them to his presence. Abu Sufian, an inveterate enemy of the Prophet, was among these merchants, and he is responsible for the account of the interview which took place between the Emperor and himself. When the Arab merchants were introduced to the Christian Emperor, he asked, through an interpreter, "Which of you is nearest of kin to this man who claims to be a prophet?" "I," was the answer from Abu Sufian. Then he was ordered to stand nearer, while his companions who stood behind him were asked to contradict him if he told a lie. The Emperor then began to put to him some questions, which are so intelligent and so helpful to a seeker after truth that their reproduction, with the replies they elicited, will benefit many of our readers in determining the truth of the Lord of Islam.

HERACLIUS : "What kind of family does he (the Prophet) come from?"

ABU SUFIAN : "He belongs to a noble family."

HERACLIUS : "Did ever any among you put forward such a claim before?"

ABU SUFIAN : "No."

HERACLIUS : "Was any of his ancestors a king?"

ABU SUFIAN : "No."

* We have not sent thee but to *men generally* as a herald of glad tidings and a warner (The Quran 34: 128). We have sent thee but a Mercy to *the Worlds* (21: 108). Say: "O men, verily I am the apostle of God unto you all" (7: 158).

HERACLIUS : "Do the rich or the poor generally believe in him?"

ABU SUFIAN : "It is mostly the poor that follow him."

HERACLIUS : "Are his followers increasing in number or are they falling off?"

ABU SUFIAN : "They are increasing incessantly."

HERACLIUS : "Do any of his followers relinquish his faith after having once accepted it?"

ABU SUFIAN : "No."

HERACLIUS : "Has he ever been guilty of perfidy?"

ABU SUFIAN : "Never."

HERACLIUS : "Do you fight against him?"

ABU SUFIAN : "Yes."

HERACLIUS : "Which of you comes off victorious?"

ABU SUFIAN : "Sometimes he is victorious and sometimes we are victorious."

HERACLIUS : "What does he bid you do?"

ABU SUFIAN : "He bids us abandon the worship of our idols and adore one God; to give up the practices of our forefathers; say prayers; to give alms; to observe truth and purity; to abstain from fornication and vice; and to respect the ties of kinship."

What Heraclius meant by these questions, and what conclusions he arrived at after he received the above answers, we can see from what the Emperor had himself to say on this score. With reference to his first question, he remarked that prophets have always been raised from respectable families. (Scions of low extractions fail to command popular respect, and low birth serves as a barrier to their securing a following among the people to whom they are sent as messengers of God. There may be pious and even saintly men among the mean born, but those whom God selects to act as His messengers to His people are invariably of respectable birth.) With regard to the second question, the Emperor observed: "If any of the Quresh had laid claim to prophethood before him, one might have thought he was only imitating him." As to the third question, Heraclius remarked: "If any of his forefathers had been a king, one might have suspected that he was seeking the kingdom of his royal ancestors." From the seventh question he argued: "If he had never before been guilty of falsehood with respect to man, he could not be now supposed to have been guilty of falsehood with regard to God." With regard to the remaining question, the Christian king said that if what Abu Sufian had said was true, there was no doubt as to the truth of the Prophet, for such were undoubtedly the signs of a true prophet.

Having read the letter of the Prophet, Heraclius asked his chief men to meet him in the royal camp at Hunis. There he addressed them as follows: "Ye Chiefs of Rome, if you desire

safety and guidance follow the Arabian Prophet." They all started aside, raised their crosses, and waved them aloft in the air. Thereupon Heraclius said that he only wanted to test their faith, and that he was satisfied with their firmness and devotion. Whether Heraclius was himself convinced of the truth of the Holy Prophet and, despairing of his chief men's conversion, and being unwilling to lose his kingdom, desisted, it is beyond our power to ascertain.

THE SOURCES OF MUHAMMAD'S INSPIRATIONS.

THE MUSLIM CONCEPTION OF GOD.

By M. H. QDWAI, Barrister-at-Law.

THE sublime theism and the practical code of morals preached by Muhammad were not derived from either the Jews or the Christians. Of the former Mr. Justice Ameerali says: "The characteristics which had led the Israelites repeatedly to lapse into idolatry in their original homes, when seers were in their midst to denounce their backslidings, would hardly preserve them from the heathenism of their Arab mothers. With an idea of the God of Abraham they would naturally combine a materialistic conception of the Deity, and hence we find them rearing a statue representing Abraham, with the ram beside him ready for sacrifice, in the Kaaba."

To the credit of the Jews, be it said, I am not aware that they ever claimed to be Muhammad's teachers, but as Christians have often attributed that character to themselves as well as to the Israelites, it may be as well to see what Gibbon has to say on the matter. "The Christians of the seventh century," he writes, "had insensibly relapsed into a semblance of paganism; their public and private vows were addressed to the relics and images that disgraced the temples of the East: the throne of the Almighty was darkened by a crowd of martyrs, saints and angels, the objects of popular veneration; and the Collyridian heretics, who flourished in the fruitful soil of Arabia, invested the Virgin Mary with the name and honours of a goddess. The mysteries of the Trinity and Incarnation appear to contradict the principle of the Divine Unity. In their obvious sense, they introduce three equal deities, and transform the man Jesus into the substance of the Son of God: an orthodox commentary will satisfy only a believing mind. . . . The creed of Mahomet is free from the suspicion of ambiguity, and the Quran is a glorious testimony to the Unity of God."

Could such people even approach, I ask, the conception of the God of Muhammad, which, as may be gathered from passages like the following, is to this day so far above the ideal of the Christian and other religions, in spite of reforms and revivals? Here are some of the Quran's descriptions:—

"He is Allah beside whom there is none who should be served, the Knower of the unseen and seen; He is the Beneficent, the Merciful. He is Allah beside whom there is no God, the King, the Holy, the Author of Peace, the Granter of Security, Guardian over all, the Mighty, the Restorer of every loss, the Possessor of every greatness; High is Allah above what they set up with Him. He is Allah, the Maker of all things, the Creator of all existence, the Fashioner of all images—His are the most excellent and beautiful attributes (that man could imagine); everything that exists in the heavens or in the earth declares His glory and His perfection, and He is the Mighty, the Wise" (59: 22—24). He is God, the all-Hearing, the all-Seeing, the Deliverer from affliction, the Generous, the Gracious, the Forgiving, the Near-at-hand, who loves good and hates evil, who will take account of all human actions.

"Say: O God, possessor of All power, Thou givest power to whom Thou wilt, and from whom Thou wilt Thou takest it away! Thou raisest up whom Thou wilt, and whom Thou wilt Thou dost abase! In Thy hand is good, for Thou art over all things potent."—(3: 25.)

"There is no other to be worshipped but He, the Living, the Eternal. No slumber seizeth Him, nor sleep. His whatsoever is in the Heavens, and whatsoever is in the earth. Who is he that can intercede with Him, but by His own permission, He knoweth what hath been before them and what shall be after them; yet nought of His knowledge shall they grasp, save what He willeth. His throne reacheth over the Heavens and the earth, and the upholding of both burdeneth Him not, and He is the High, the Great."—(2: 56.)

"Say: He is alone, He is not dependent on anything, nor anything is independent of Him; He does not beget nor is He begotten, and there is none like Him."—(112.)

There is no book in the world in which God has been made such a theme of discourse as in the Holy Quran; and one who wants to study the true conception of Muhammad concerning

God should go through the Holy Quran itself. The passages quoted above had been selected at random to enable the student to form some idea, but God's attributes are to be found in thousands of other places in the Holy Book. I do not propose here to enter into a discussion as to the existence of God, though this has not been left unproved in the Quran upon a rational basis. Starting with the assumption that GOD exists, we have to see which form of religion presents an Ideal God before Humanity? Where can we find such an Ideal Being, before Whom the haughtiest, the mightiest and the wisest man would kneel down involuntarily? Has any such conception of God been formed elsewhere, which presents Him as a Perfect Being? If there is no such Being, I for one would never kneel down to him!

MAN-GOD, NO GOD.

Will they bow to a man-god who cannot be absolutely free from human weaknesses and animal passions? Will they bow down to a god who has a sharer or a partner or an opponent of an equal power? Will they bow down to an impotent and helpless god, who has to undergo the sacrifice of himself before he can help his creatures? Will they prostrate themselves before an exacting tyrant who does not say, as the God of the Quran says:—

"No soul is burdened beyond his power."

Will they worship such unjust god, one who leaves no discretion to them and sends them into the world as sinners, and then punishes them for those sins afterwards, or brings an innocent person to punishment by way of atonement? A god who is mortal and physical, dead or sleeping, fatigued or unnerved, can hardly be accepted as an object of worship.

I am prepared to extend the challenge still further to those who say: if it be considered that all the different religions were framed thousands of years ago, and so they would, in the present advanced time, if given an opportunity, form a better conception of the Highest Being, I would ask all such people, in the words of the Quran, to combine and present any conception of God better than that given to us in the Quran through Muhammad:—

"Say: Verily, were men and Djinn combined to produce the like of the Quran, they could not produce its like, though the one should help the other.—(17: 90).

I am prepared to go still further, and ask all the legislators, social reformers, moralists, generals and statesmen, with whom religion has only this efficacy that it controls human passions and improves human frailties, even where other agencies fail, to form a syndicate and produce together the conception of such an efficient and useful god from their point of view; but then, I

say, they will have to fall back upon the God of Islam, as preached by Muhammad.

And yet a step further I am prepared to go: Suppose the number of such philosophers as the Rt. Hon. A. J. Balfour and of such scientist as Sir Oliver Lodge increases, and they feel a craving for Theism and for soul, and they meet together to conceive an ideal which would satisfy their cravings, surely they, I repeat, will fail to form any such ideal which had not been anticipated fourteen hundred years ago by Muhammad.

Under these circumstances will anybody blame me if I ask again, as I asked on May 18, 1905, while celebrating the birthday of the Lord Muhammad in London:—

“Forget, if you will, the wonderful revolution brought about by Muhammad, or the practical code of high morality which he diffused, deny him the credit for all else, if you are so far the slave of prejudice, but can you shut your eyes to his God? As He is really shown in the Quran—not as calumnious Christian controversialists say that it represents Him, which is quite a different thing—it is impossible to conceive aught holier, nobler, purer, more sublime, more perfect, more supreme and more worthy of the Godhead than the God Whom Muhammad worshipped. The Ideal cannot be improved upon: one attribute taken from it would mar its perfection, not one could be added to it that would not be superfluous. Had Muhammad done nothing besides giving the world this lofty Conception, he would still occupy the highest rank among the seekers after the Divine and the benefactors of mankind. The Ideal he loved will ever stand forth as a protest against all attempts to return to paganism, polytheism, the worship of idols or of matter. He has boldly and indelibly impressed the notion of the strictest Monotheism upon the pages of history, and towards this notion rational man cannot but drift surely, if slowly.”

ISLAMIC REVIEW.—With this conception of God before us, if we fail to appreciate even a tittle of Godhood in that Gentle Philosopher and Pious Carpenter, the Son of Mary, we may be excused. Call the God of the Quran an Autocrat if you will; but read His attributes through His own work. Nature is the best mirror of its author. Disillusionise yourself of all prepossessions and prejudices; empty your mind of all such conceptions of God as are given in various creeds and religions; adore only that Omnipresent, Omnipotent and Omniscient Power, the First Cause, whose intelligent Hand and Will is discernible in every atom; study His way by which He rules the whole universe, and the God of the Quran appears before you with all His splendid grandeur and majestic glory.

Know that everything is vanity save God.

—*Labid, an Arabic Poet.*

GOD'S GIFT TO MAN, AND MAN'S VOW TO GOD.

IN this country, through the misrepresentations of those whose education should teach them at least to be truthful and accurate, the position of Mahomedan women is looked upon as degraded in this world, and hopeless as far as the next world is concerned. I have lived a long time in the East, and number among my friends many Mahomedans for whom I have a great affection and respect, and never heard of a Mahomedan ill-treating his wife. There may be such cases amongst the very low classes, but I have never come across them myself. The true Muslim regards his women folk as sacred, and he spares no pains to make them happy and comfortable. Some years ago I wrote the following lines in praise of a really good woman, and I am sure that most Muslims will agree with the sentiment when they think of their mothers and their wives :—

A GOOD WOMAN.

Sweet offering of our Maker's care,
To crown my life thou didst appear
And give me joy untold :
A ray divine
Of sweet sunshine
Turned all life's dross to gold.

To fill an aching void thou gav'st
A treasured promise—and thou mad'st
My soul to dance with joy :
In thy dear eyes
A glad surprise
Shone pure, without alloy.

From sad thoughts of a chequered past
We'll turn for ever, and at last
Open the sacred page
Where, written there,
The promise fair,
Stands true from age to age.

Thus happy in our children, love,
We'll ever look to God above
And bless His Holy Name :
No thoughts of fears,
No trace of tears,
Shall mar our happiness.

Dear Father, from Thy children now,
 Accept the noblest human vow
 That they will work for Thee :
 Thy love adore,
 Thy gifts explore,
 Through all eternity.*

The whole teaching of the Koran is opposed to idolatry in any shape or form, and therefore men are admonished not to marry idolatresses or allow their daughters to marry idolaters. There is so much idolatry in certain of the Churches at the present time, and it would be well if the teachings of our Holy Prophet (blessed be his memory!) were more widely disseminated. We Mahomedans are guided and helped through life by our Book—the Holy Koran :—

“Mankind was but one people ; and God sent prophets to announce glad tidings and to warn ; and He sent down with them the Book of Truth, that it might decide the disputes of men ; and none disputed but those to whom the Book had been given, after the clear tokens had reached them—being full of mutual jealousy. And God guided those who believed to the truth of that about which, by His permission, they had disputed ; for God guideth whom He pleaseth into the straight path.”

Wherever women are alluded to in the Koran the greatest respect and reverence is enjoined—love for the mother being almost taken for granted, and kindness and affectionate care of the wife being insisted upon with the strongest emphasis.

The following passages occur in that chapter of the Koran entitled “Women” :—

“O men ! fear your Lord, who hath created you of one man (nafs, soul) and of him created his wife, and from these twain hath spread abroad so many men and women. And fear ye God, in whose name ye ask mutual favours, and reverence the wombs that bare you. Verily is God watching over you !”

“Give women their dowry freely ; but if of themselves they give up aught thereof to you, then enjoy it as convenient and profitable : and entrust not to the incapable the substance which God hath placed with you for their support ; but maintain them therewith, and clothe them, and speak to them with kindly speech.”

* “Thoughts of the Future.” Walter Scott & Co., Felling-on-Tyne.

"Men are superior to women on account of the qualities with which God hath gifted the one above the other, and on account of the outlay they make from their substance for them. Virtuous women are obedient, careful, during the husband's absence, because God hath of them been careful."

"And if a wife fear ill-usage or aversion on the part of her husband, then shall it be no fault in them if they can agree with mutual agreement, for agreement is best. Men's souls are prone to avarice ; but if ye act kindly and fear God, then verily, your actions are not unnoticed by God !"

"Among my followers, the best of men are they who are best and kindest to their women."

"Woman is sovereign in the house of her husband."

"The world is full of objects of joy and delight, and the best source of delight is a pious and chaste woman."

"And one of His signs is that He has created wives for you of your own species, that you may be comforted with them, and has put love and tenderness between you."

These passages in the Holy Koran are sufficient to show how utterly mistaken are those who make reckless and false statements concerning the position of women in the Muslim world. I could give many other instances, but I must now close this article, and write of some of my personal experiences in a future number of this *Review*.

HEADLEY.

The Holy Prophet says:—

"Paradise lies at the feet of thy mother. The rights of women are sacred ; see that women are maintained in the rights attributed to them. Do not prevent your women from coming to Mosque. The best of you before God and His creation are those who are best in their own family and best to their wives. A virtuous wife is man's best treasure. Fear God in regard to the treatment of your wives, they are your helpers. You have taken them on the security of God and made them lawful by the words of God. The woman is sovereign in the house of her husband. The world is full of objects of joy and delight, and the best source of delight is a pious and chaste woman."

God said, 'I am near the hope of whoso trusteth in Me; and I am with him and near him when he remembereth Me.'

—*The Holy Prophet.*

WOKING MUSLIM ENGLISH CENTRE.

APOSTASY FROM ISLAM AND ITS CONSEQUENCES.

AFTER inserting the able letter from the Rt. Hon. Lord Headley, showing in his usual laconic way the absurdity of the charge that Islam punishes apostasy from it with death, the subject hardly needed any further comment, had it not been for the following, which appeared in the *Woking News & Mail* of March 16, with the heading "Woking Moslems' English Centre," while reporting the proceedings of the Church Missionary Society Anniversary held on March 9:—

An address was then given by the Rev. H. J. Weitbrecht, whose subject was "Islam in India." He detailed the beliefs of the Moslems, and stated that anything like apostasy from Islam was punishable by death. In Islam, slavery existed as well as polygamy. The movement had spread to England, where at Woking they had their headquarters. Speeches were being delivered expounding the Moslem faith, but they did not mention all. They should be thankful, however, that the Moslems were beginning to realise that they must adopt Christianity, and they were introducing Christian principles in their faith. It was a movement which had to be fought, for it was not one which tended for the betterment of the people.

We could wish that the speaker of the above could quote "facts and figures," or some Quranic text to support his statements. Vague statements and general assertions are but faulty logic and risky argument. This, unfortunately, is a characteristic feature of a missionary writing against Islam. But he cannot do otherwise. He plays with fiction and imagination. Whatever of ill he finds in the annals of his own religion he ascribes it to the other. That apostasy from a faith entails death is a Christian tradition, and never countenanced by Islam. But it is one of the stock charges so unscrupulously hurled against our head. We know that it is hopeless to correct those who are interested in remaining, as well as keeping others, in error. But the days are changed now. Missionary writings are now received as nearly identical with fiction. There are thousands of thousands of seekers after truth who want enlightenment, and it is to enlighten such noble souls that we intend to discuss here consequences of "apostasy" from the Islamic point of view. But before coming to the direct question in view, we wish to remind our readers of the golden Muslim motto in the matter of conscience, enunciated

by the Quran in the words "No compulsion in religion," which we have often repeated. Islam respects individual opinion and encourages private judgment. It gives no countenance to punishing anyone for conscience' sake. Besides, as the Quran teaches, the time for one's accounting for his beliefs and disbeliefs is not the present life, but the life after death. Does it not sound unreasonable even to imagine that a book with such clear teaching would suffer punishment of a renegade from its teachings?

We quote here some of the verses from the Holy Quran which deal with the subject:—

But whoever of you shall turn from his RELIGION and die an infidel their work shall be fruitless in this world and in the next, and they shall be consigned to the fire.—II. : 214.

The verse does not say that the apostate should be put to death or divested of all their rights: it simply says that their work shall be of no avail, and that they shall suffer in hell from their turning away from the true path. The words "and die an infidel" in the text is significant. The apostates have been spoken of as dying a natural death. The word used in the original, being a derivative of "Maut," shows that a mere change of belief is not punishable with death according to the Holy Book.

The fifth chapter of the Holy Quran is generally considered to be the one revealed last, and in that chapter apostasy is spoken of in the following words:—

O ye, who believe! Should any of you desert his religion, God will then raise up a people whom He loves and who love Him, truly towards the faithful, invincible against the unbelievers. For the cause of God will they contend, and not fear the blame of any blamer. This is the grace of God on whom He will bestow it. And God is all-embracing, Omniscient.—V. 59.

Here, too, no punishment is prescribed for the apostates, but it is only said that, if anyone deserts the faith of Islam after accepting it, the Muslims should not be grieved thereat, for in his place a whole people would be brought into the fold of Islam. In a verse considered to have been revealed earlier, only suffering in the next life is mentioned as the requital of going back to the unbelief.

Whoso after he has believed in God denies Him, if he were forced to it, and if his heart remains steadfast in the faith, shall be guiltless; but whoso opens his heart to infidelity, on them shall be wrath from God, and a severe punishment awaits them. This, because they have loved this present life beyond the next In the next world shall they be losers beyond a doubt.—XVI. 108-110.

This verse was revealed when the Holy Prophet was still at Mecca and the Muslims were persecuted severely. The fact that the Quran speaks of apostates in earlier as well as later verses in the same terms shows clearly that the law remained the same all through.

We now quote two more verses from the Quran which, in a way, deal with the question in issue decisively:—

How shall God guide a people who, after they had believed and borne witness that the Apostle was true, and after that clear proof of his mission had preached them, disbelieved? For God guides not the people who transgress. These! their recompense is, that the curse of God, and of angels, and of men, one and all is on them, save those who after this repent and amend; for verily, God is gracious, merciful! As for those who deny after having believed and then their denial becomes greater and greater—their repentance shall by no means be accepted by God. And these! they are the erring ones.—III. 80-84.

Verily, they who believed, then became unbelievers, then believed and again became unbelievers, and then increased their unbelief—God will not forgive them or guide them into the right path.—IV. 13, 6.

These are the only verses of the Holy Quran relating to apostacy that we have been able to find out. It will be seen that in none of these is any punishment prescribed for the apostate except the suffering which they must undergo in the next life for dying in unbelief. If immediate death was the punishment for the offence of apostasy, the last two verses quoted above would have been meaningless: "They who believed then became unbelievers—and again became unbelievers"—clearly refers to those who accepted and deserted the faith of Islam more than once. It was an impossibility if death was the punishment of an apostate how "*the denial*" could become "*greater and greater*," as the verse shows, if their first denial was to be attended with death punishment.

(To be continued.)

MUSLIM BAPTISMAL PRONOUNCEMENT

THE following we read in *Light*, of London, February 14, 1914:—

Muslim India, for January, maintains its interest not only for those who are in sympathy with Islam, but also for students of comparative religion. Lord Headley contributes "A New Prayer," full of devotional feeling and certainty, Catholic in spirit, with its allusions to the "Holy Prophets, Moses, Christ and Mahomet"; and if we read of "the Divinely inspired

Mahomet" in one sentence, it is followed almost immediately by a reference to "Our Lord Jesus Christ."

* * * * *

It will not be of less interest to most of our Western readers to read the following pronouncement which every new convert to Islam is asked to make when he or she (as the case may be) embraces the religion of the Holy Prophet Muhammad :—

I do testify that I do not believe in any other deity but Allah to be served and worshipped. I do testify that I believe in the Divine messengership of Muhammad. I do not believe in the Divinity of Jesus Christ, but I accept Him as man and a Prophet of God. I do accept the missions of all the prophets of the world, Abraham, Noah, Moses, David, Solomon and Jesus, and others, as of Divine origin, and I do not make any difference between them. I do promise to act on the injunctions of the Quran, and accept all the teachings of the other prophets of the world in their original purity. I promise to lead a Muslim life, and to abstain from the path of iniquity and unrighteousness.

This baptismal formula is not a modern ingenuity to suit Western susceptibilities. It comes out of the teachings of the Quran. The noble Muslim Peer had simply the Baptism of God in Islam before his mind in the following words of the Quran when he wrote "The New Prayer":—

Say ye : "We believe in God and that which hath been sent down to us, and that which hath been sent down to Abraham and Ismael and Isaac and Jacob and the tribes, and that which hath been given to Moses and to Jesus and that which was given to the prophets from their Lord. No difference do we make between any of them, and to God are we resigned.

"If, therefore, they believe even as ye believe, then they have true guidance; but if they turn back, then do they cut themselves off from you: and God will suffice to protect thee against them, for He is the Hearer, the Knower.

"Islam is the Baptism* of God; and who is better to baptise than God? And Him do we serve."

What, then, is Islam? Complete submission to Divine control in the mode and conduct of life, and implicit and unreserved obedience to laws revealed to man by God, in preference to all his prepossession, inclination or judgment.

* In our next we will explain the theory and object of Baptism, which is accomplished only in Islam.—ED.

With such cosmopolitan conception, Islam therefore embraces all such religions as have been preached by teachers inspired by God in various ages and different countries. Resignation to the Divine Will is literally the spirit of Islam ; and the expression of the High Will was not confined to any time or place. If the Will of the Most High comes to guide mankind, it must find its manifestation whenever and wherever there was a man. A Muslim under the Quranic teaching must accept it as such. He, of course, has to ascertain its authenticity, and when it is established he must accept it as the Word of God. This we read in the book of a religion which ignorance and calumny brands as the religion of intolerance and narrow-mindedness. Try to find, if you will, in the whole non-Islamic sacred literature a parallel to it, and you are sure to fail in such an attempt. Mark these words, which guide us in our conduct towards those who reject our religion : " But if they turn back, then they do cut themselves off from you, and God will suffice to protect thee against them." A Muslim has not to worry afterwards about those to whom he bears his message of Islam. He has not even to use persuasion, leave alone force. He has preached the truth according to the light he receives, and then he must leave the matter in the hand of God. With this noble teaching, which we have always observed since the appearance of the Holy Prophet, we are blamed for the use of the sword in the spread of our religion. That everyone judges others after his own measure is only too true of these libellers of Islam in the Christian camp.

SAMSARA, KARMA, SURSUM.

IN dealing with Hindu philosophy two doctrines must always be taken into consideration. They lie at the root of all Hindu thought, and dominate all the currents flowing into ideas and actions. Samsara, metempsychosis, or transmigration of souls. They are spiritualists of an extreme type. The Atman, or soul, is an individual entity, the real being behind or rather within the man ; immortal, it migrates from one form to another, either human, bestial or vegetal, remaining an inhabitant of that particular material body during the life of that body. It is more individual and more personal, therefore, than the body it temporarily inhabits :—

" Never the spirit was born ; the spirit shall cease to be never ;

Never was time it was not ; end and beginning are dreams ;

Birthless and deathless and changeless remaineth the spirit for ever ;

Death hath not touched it at all, dead though the house of it seems."

—ARNOLD (*The Song Celestial*).

I have often after reading those lines wondered what the late Prof. Clifford's internal monitor would have said on hearing them. "Tell it not in Gath; whisper it not in Ascalon!"

Bound up with the doctrine of Samsara is the doctrine of Karma (the Sanskrit word for actions). As the soul migrates through a succession of endless stages, upon its actions in any one stage depends its plane in the next. It may therefore rise, moving on to a higher stage, or go backwards to a lower one. For a time it may even rest in a region of bliss, but it must take, sooner or later, to its wanderings again. Some leading thinkers believe that a time must come when it has totally eliminated *self*; when that time arrives it has finally attained to the eternal rest of Nirvana. The doctrine varies, as it must do, with the intellectuality of the person holding the belief. The Buddhist doctrines of Atman, Samsara, and Karma and Nirvana are quite different from the above; perhaps, some day, I shall have an opportunity of dealing with the Buddhist view.

"The world is a delusive charm of the magician called Maya!" says His Holiness the Mahatma Sri Agamya Guru Paramahansa. His saying may be accepted as the teaching of his school; it is also a fundamental principle of many other sects. Things are unreal, an illusion, the senses deceive us. The gorgeous nebulae, the burning stars, the whirling planets and the blazing sun are to them phantasies of the imagination, bubbles created by an invisible vibrating force caused by the sensitive flow of the mind through external space. The snow-clad hills, teeming forests, shining rivers and mighty oceans; the earth and all its myriad forms and wonders of life and mysteries of birth and growth and death: illusions, dreams, visions with no abiding value. The reality lies behind, they hide it from us.

A ONE-SIDED CONCEPTION OF REALITY.

A professing monism that ends in a phantastic dualism. Teaching asceticism as the greatest virtue, it must lead, and has led, to cessation and stagnation of all those activities that encourage action for the well-being of humanity and make lasting contributions to success and progress.

The immolation of man on the altar of atonement, self-torture or idle contemplation, a stultifying of those forces, those powers which have made man, fostered corporeal and intellectual advancement and social progress, and evolved civilisation; and, calling this selfish immolation an attitude of love! That is not the love we want, we Muslims, nor is it the love humanity desires, the love we need. No, no! give to us the love of doing, the strength to work while it is yet day, for the night comes when all labour is at an end, when it will be asked of thee: What deeds have you accomplished? What have you done for progress? Who among the mentally weak have you assisted on the path of knowledge, and who among the physically weak have you helped on the road of life? What have you done to train the innocent and lift the fallen, to inculcate nobler ideals

and raise higher aspirations? Have you taught virtue to the unfortunate and duty to the virtuous? Have you upheld the beautiful and denounced the gross? Have you stood for truth against sneers and contempt and laughter, alone or with scarcely a friend? Have you stood undaunted and undismayed, fearless for the right, while people shunned you and the great mass passed you by on the other side? Have you fought for an unpopular cause or unpopular ideals that you believed in? That is the supreme test of manhood, of nobleness and righteousness, the true Jihad of Islam. What have you done to benefit your fellows? that is the question.

Aye, what we want is men—men who will love, but love to dare and do, who will go down to death shouting and singing the battle-song of truth. Men who fear not to stand in the open under the oriflamme of day, knee-deep in the red-hot lava of the stream of life, foremost in the arena of deeds and thoughts. Men whose souls will be the pilot stars to lead their scions on to gentler deeds and nobler triumphs.

Out, men, out into the light and the sunshine where the birds sing and the waters laugh. Out from the wordly sea of *Samsara* into the mighty ocean of *Sursum*. Out from the mists of Maya into the realms of the Real, where the Genius of Mankind on the Anvil of Time is forging the Excalibur of Truth brighter and more eternal than ever flashed in the hands of Arthur. Out, while the day lasts, for the night comes. We do not move in a vale of dreams or a valley of mists, but in a universe quick with feeling, rich in mind-stuff, and awake with thought; where activity is progress and life, and stagnation is decay and the Herald of Death.

The statement that *all* Things phenomenal are an illusion is valueless. To say that *all* Things are real is just as meaningless. It is reducing the terms Real and Unreal to nullity. One might as well assert that *all* stars were large, or that *all* men were tall. The terms large and tall in such a case are without meaning. It is the fallacy of using a term of relative mode where the term stands as a comparison between objects or series of the same mode and applying the term to an absolute mode or total series where no comparison is possible.

WHAT IS REALITY?

In his "Letters on Reasoning," Mr. J. M. Robertson, M.P., tells how, walking one day in one of the parks, he sought a definition of Reality, and the following flashed upon him:—

"DEGREE OF RELATEDNESS."

I was rather surprised when I read it, because it showed that Robertson was not acquainted with the works of Dr. Paul Carns, the ablest exponent of Positive Monism. Years before Carns gave a definition of Reality—

"The effectiveness of Things in their degree of relatedness."

There is a slight difference in the definitions. Robertson left a loop-hole for the extremists, both in the materialistic and the spiritualistic camps, especially the latter. Carns narrowed the loop-hole, that was all. Those are the best definitions I have found. If any person knows a better, I shall be pleased to learn of it. The test of Reality, therefore, is degree of relatedness, and we leave it at that.

After all, it is a secondary consideration whether phenomena are real or unreal, whether they are or are not phantoms conjured up by the mind. Facts are the data on which all our thinking is founded, they are the bricks with which we construct all our ideas and raise the whole fabric of our mental images. They serve the purpose of orientation in this world. We methodically arrange them, study the movements and the uniformities of things, and deduce from them laws to guide our conduct—laws universal in their validity and eternal in their range. On the correctness of our interpretation of their relations and uniformities depends the righteousness of our laws, of our progress—socially, commercially, and mentally.

Facts, of course, are not the whole of Reality; but facts are real, as real as the changeless amid the transient and ever-moving panorama of causation; as real as the eternal amid the mutation of mutable form; as real as the laws which measure our conduct and dominate and control our actions according to the conceptions thereof. They vary only in degree of relatedness. Our very intelligence is our measure of the knowledge of things. Intelligence is neither a reason nor a cause, but a consequence, a resultant. We only know phenomena, our knowledge is a knowledge of things and their relations. Mutation goes on eternally.

Men may dream dreams and conjure up visions, and some may imagine that the whole kaleidoscope of nature is constructed by the same subtle metamorphosis of memory images, and that some day we shall wake up and find the whole fabric has dissolved into nothingness, like Sennacherib's army waking up to discover they were all dead corpses.

But there is very little illusion in this world of ours when the rifles flash and bayonets gleam, and men perish for love or glory in the hell-trench of battle, or in the Arctic or Antarctic wastes amid ice and snow. Illusion! When the love light dances in the eyes of the daughters and the eyes of the sons of men; when the children prattle in the morning and the sky is golden with the sunrise, or when in the evening it is red with flame.

The most of us love those illusions: those illusions we call valleys, and hills, and woodlands, and pastures, and moors; pastures pied with buttercups and daises, and the ragweed's royal crown; hills where we walk knee-deep amid the bracken and the heather; woods where the fauna and the flora are athrob with life.

There is shouting on the mountain sides and singing in the valleys, and the great world pulses to the movement of the spheres. Atoms combine and separate, and combinations form and dissolve away. Substance passes from form to form, and knowledge grows from more to more. Forms are being continually created and continually destroyed as substance runs through its ceaseless phases. But pure form-spirit is being as rigidly preserved, and is building up mind and making it an eternal storehouse of memory images, purifying it in the fire of thought, bringing it nearer and nearer the Divine. The world is not only an evolution but an involution, an epigenesis of Things.

JOHN PARKINSON.

SIMPLICITY OF LIFE

OF

THE EARLY CALIPHS OF ISLAM.

THE following we take from "Al-Bayan," an introduction by Maulvi Aboo Muhammad Abdul Haqq of Delhi to his commentary on the Quran. "Al-Bayan" in itself is an exhaustive work of erudition on comparative religions. It treats of all the old and new religions, and discusses their comparative teachings dispassionately. It teems with logical arguments and reasonable statements, and may be read with advantage by everyone desirous to know of Islam and its supremacy over other religions. The book has also been rendered into English for the benefit of the English-speaking people, and can be had from Haji Muhammad Ishaqmuhammad Ahmad, general merchant, Sadur Bazaar, Delhi, India :—

"It has been acknowledged by all the world that the Caliphs after taking possession of the fruitful kingdoms of the world within the short space of time, of which there is no parallel in the universe, were accustomed to pass durvesh-like (hermit-like) lives, and to perform religious and moral duties with the same devotion up to the point of death.

"There was no particular palace for the Caliphs to live in, nor the royal building to sit under; their houses afforded less comfort than those of middle-class men. The Caliphs were not distinct from the common people of their country. They used to live in a state that was lower than the aforesaid people. The coat (Caliph) Omar used to put on was patched up with many patches. There was no watch at their door, nor did they drive in carriages with great show and splendour, but they were accustomed to walk lonely, like common persons, wherever they wished. They were not ashamed to do their own domestic works of buying and selling. Every complainant was at liberty to appear before them. On account of their remaining busy in

their official duties, their nation had allowed for them a very poor monthly stipend, which amounted to nearly 30 or 32 rupees* a month, on which they had to support themselves and their family. In addition to all the above-mentioned things, to wake up in the night for God's worship, to be indifferent to the troubles of the world, and to prepare themselves night and day for the next world, are clear proofs of their supremacy over all. In morality, humility, meekness, forbearance, self-denial and forgiveness they were counted as perfect men. A man of the lowest grade had authority to make objection to their practice, and they had listened to them as they did to the respectable persons of their nation. They were unable to beat with a lap or to imprison for a day the lowest person of their society."

* * * * *

"Omar was on his travels to Medina and the night was dark. Without knowing he stepped on another man's foot. who said : "Art thou blind?" "Excuse me, please, the darkness of the night hath blinded me," said Omar to the afflicted person, who, having recognised him, began to make excuses. "Never mind, Sir, you are right." "The fault is actually mine," replied Omar. When Jerusalem, the Holy City, was surrounded by the Muslim army, the citizens agreed to make over the city to them on condition that their Caliph should come, whom they might be able to see, and with whom they might be able to make a formal agreement. The people of Medina were of different opinions concerning the matter. But Ali said, "It is surely desirable that the Head of the Faithful may go there!" Now Omar took his journey to Syria, and what kind of preparations were made for him by his people? A camel, on whose back was put a little flour of parched barley† for his meals, with a wooden dish hanging on it, and a slave to accompany him. When Omar rode half-way his slave used to take the nose-string and lead the camel. When the slave rode on it, Omar used to alight to take the string and to conduct it. At their halting places they were accustomed to do their work alternately. In the intervening districts, wherever they heard complaints against officers and the cruelties they practised therein, they made amendments. When they reached their destination the Muslim army as a reception for them raised the cry of *Allaho Akbar*, the Great God. The

* Thirty rupees are equal to £2.—ED.

† "The sublimity of his journey," says Gibbon, when giving an account of Omar's journey to Jerusalem, "is more illustrious than the royal pageants of vanity and oppression. The conqueror of Persia and Syria was mounted on a red camel, which carried, besides his person, a bag of corn, a bag of dates, a wooden dish, and a leather bottle of water. Wherever he halted the company, without distinction, were invited to partake of his homely fare, and the repast was consecrated by the prayers and exhortation of the Commander of the Faithful."—ED.

people of the city found out that the Head of the Faithful had come. Now the Head was compelled by his people to put on fine garments, to ride on a good horse, and then to converse with the Christians. Having gone four or five paces, he dismounted from his horse, and said: "Bring my patched-up clothing, for of this garment and appearance I feel proud. I have heard from the Messenger of God: Whosoever hath a bit of pride in his heart, he will not be able even to smell the scent of heaven.

"The facts that concern Ali are more surprising than these. One of them is the following: During his reign he had bought an armour from a Jew and had paid him its price. However, the Jew, in order to try him, instituted a case against him in the Court. Shuriah was the Qazi (the judge) in those days. According to the common course of the Mahommadan law, he summoned also his king (Ali), who attended the Court and was informed of the suit that was brought against him by a Jew. Ali said that he had already paid the price. "You are now responsible to prove it, else I will have to pass a decree against you," said the Qazi. Ali brought his son Imam Husain and his slave Qumbar as his witnesses. The Jew made an objection to it, saying that a son's evidence for his father and that of a slave for his master cannot be accepted. The judge, in acknowledgment of the cross-question, passed a decree against Ali, who paid the money to the Jew for the second time. The Jew having obtained the decree money confessed that he was a liar. It was merely to try the Muslim Court and the justice practised by the judge and the King. Afterwards for this very fact he became a convert to Islam.

ISLAMIC REVIEW.—These Caliphs were the first fruits of Islam. By their practice and precept they showed to the world how resigned they were to the Will of God. Given all the means to lead an easy life, with vast empires yielding considerable revenue at their feet, they never swerved an inch from the strict path of their duty towards God and their fellow creatures. We do not find any parallel to them in the history of the followers of other religions. Humility shown by the adherents of a religion merged in "slaves and serfs" is necessity and not virtue. So was the case of Christianity in its beginning days. One who has no roof to lay his head under for shelter may be meek and humble minded. He cannot do otherwise. His humble disposition and meekness of spirit is the creation of his environment. He has still to prove that he possesses genuine meekness if he is given all the favourable chances open to the Holy Prophet and his first Caliphs. It is Islam, *and only Islam*, which has produced true meekness, nobility of mind, and sacrificial spirit, even in men of means and position; and it is a hopeless task to look for similar examples elsewhere.